

939
A
DEFENCE
OF THE
DOCTRINE
OF THE
MAN-CHRIST JESUS
His Descent from HEAVEN,

As it is laid down and prov'd in the Bishop of
GLOUCESTER's Discourse upon that Subject.

James E. K.
With a farther Confirmation of it from the
Old Testament.

By a Presbyter of the Church of England.

To which is annex'd by the *Publisher*,
A *Second* Defence of that Doctrine;

Being an Answer to the Pretended *Confutation*
thereof, expressly Levell'd at the said *Discourse*,
in a Sermon Preach'd by *Thomas Wise, B.D. &c.*
the last *St. Peter's Day*, to the University of
Oxford; lately Printed.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *John Wyat*, at the *Rose* in *St. Paul's*
Church-Yard, 1707.

DEFENCE

OF THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

MAN-CHRIST



By the Rev. John Keble, D.D.,
Canon of Salisbury, and
Rector of St. Martin's, Vintria.

Printed by the Rev. John Keble, D.D.,
Canon of Salisbury, and
Rector of St. Martin's, Vintria.

To which is annexed by the Author,
A Short History of the Doctrine,

Being an Answer to the
Charge, that the Doctrine
is a new Invention, and
the late of the Day, to the University of
Oxford, &c.

A. D. 1840

Printed for J. Keble, at the Press in St. Paul's
Church-yard, 1840.

**T H E
PUBLISHER
T O T H E
R E A D E R.**

T *H E very Worthy Author of
this 'Defence, living many
Miles from London, sent
the Copy to me his Friend, with his
Permission to do what I thought good
with it.*

*Upon perusing it, I judg'd that it
highly deserved to see the Light; and
so did my Lord Bishop of Gloucester,
after it had been for some time in
his Hand. I shall be guilty of a great
Imper-*

The Publisher to the Reader.

~~Impertinence~~, if I spend more Words to set it off to the World. This would be such an ~~Officiousness~~ as, were I known, and never so well thought of, could stand it but in little stead, with those that are Unbyassed, and of Ability to judg of Books; who are the only Readers a wise Author can much covet. And such, I am confident, will be far from repenting the Pains of having well consider'd the following Leaves.

E R R A T A.

P. 3. l. 10. r. Argument. p. 4. l. 20. r. Article. l. 21. r. Principle. p. 5. l. 3. for it is r. they are. p. 16. l. 3. with thee should be in a different Letter from I had. p. 23. l. 12. r. Mediator is not of one. p. 29. l. 13. r. Sware. p. 55. l. 14. set the Comma after whatsoever. l. 17. r. this Word. p. 57. l. 5. set the Comma before up.

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Descent of the Man-Christ- Jesus from Heaven.

THE Doctrine of the Descent of the Man-Christ-Jesus from Heaven, doth greatly illustrate the Excellency of his Person, and our Obligation to him, as *Man*; and farther gives an easie, natural Account of many otherwise very perplexed Passages of Holy Scripture. So that, as the Bishop of Gloucester has very well observ'd, one would think

we should be extremely desirous to see it well made out. And, indeed, his Lordship hath set it, in his late Discourse, in a very clear Light; after the most Learned Dr. *Henry More*, with others, had done it much more briefly.

The Bishop has propos'd it to the World, with all Caution, Modesty, and Fairness, as well as *Clearness*; and improv'd it to the most Excellent Practical Purposes. So that it may seem not a little strange, that his *Discourse* should meet with any the least unkind and harsh Usage. But it must be acknowledg'd too, that it has met with as good Entertainment as could be expected, and abundantly better than might have been feared, considering what a strong Aversion most Men have to all Opinions, that thwart their old Notions; so that things plain, nay that are even glorious and transporting Truths to *some*, have no weight at all with *others*, nor any convincing Evidence.

Now what I design in these Papers is to shew,

First, The *Unexceptionableness* of the Bishop's Discourse.

Secondly,

Secondly, The *Excellency* of his Doctrine, and the noble Purposes it serveth.

Thirdly, To represent and farther confirm, the *Grounds* thereof: And more especially to insist upon Proofs out of the *Old Testament*, as his Lordship has done principally from the *New*. And from all together, I hope, the main Arguments will be, not a little farther illustrated and establish'd.

First, I will shew the *Unexceptionableness* of this Discourse; I mean, as to any harm it is capable of doing to our Religion, or any Article thereof.

The *Summ* of what the Bishop has advanc'd is *this*. He finding so much spoken in Scripture concerning our Lord Christ, as *Man*, as well as the Eternal Son of GOD: And moreover discerning plainly, many Passages to draw strongly and forceably to a *Local* Descent of our Lord from Heaven, like his Ascent up thither again; as certainly in their obvious and most natural Sense, they do: Finding farther, that there are Places which speak of such a Humiliation and Emptying of himself, as also such

a Reward and Exaltation upon it, as are by no Means suitable to the Eternal Son, or to his Nature as God : And, lastly, considering what a very Peculiar and Extraordinary Person, according to his *Humane* Nature, our Lord is represented to be, above all other Souls in the World beside : From *these* Considerations, and others with them, the Bishop supposeth the Soul of Christ to have been in a præ-existent State, and in this State united, for most wise and the greatest Reasons, with the Eternal *Logos*, as who was in time to be incarnate, for the Redemption of Mankind. And he conceives that this *Hypothesis* will naturally answer all the Passages in Scripture before pointed at, in general ; and clear such Difficulties as cleave to them ; being, the meanwhile, not in the least contrary to any other Texts, Articles of Faith, or Principles of Reason.

This, I say, is the Summ of his Lordship's Design. Now as to the Innocency and *Unexceptionableness* thereof, I observe,

i. That by his Doctrine he makes not the least Alteration in the Doctrine of the Glorious and Ever Blessed Trinity : The Hypostatical Union ; The Divinity, or Incarnation of Christ. All these, and the other

other Articles of our common Faith, do continue absolutely the same, *with this Doctrine, that it is without it.* So infinitely far is it from *making an Essential Change in the whole Scheme of Christianity:* From *being a jumble of Arianism and Nestorianism together:* From *overthrowing the whole Doctrine of our Salvation, and all hopes of Immortality by the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection of the Son of God:* From *destroying the whole Doctrine of our Redemption:* The coming down of the *Eternal Word from Heaven:* And the leaving nothing but a *Creature-Saviour to us.*

2. The Bishop speaks so fully and particularly of our Saviour, as the *Man-Christ*, and so magnifieth his Kindness and Condescension as *Man*, not that he had, as I now said, ever the less belief of his *Divinity*, of which he produceth the strongest Proofs, or of his most Adorable *Love as God*; but because *that* was the chief Business he had then in Hand, and the most accommodate to the Design he drove at; and what he might think, many probably wanted a more particular Consideration of.

And yet to prevent all Temptation in any to *Cavil*, he useth the very highest Expressions, in speaking of the glorious

Merit and infinite Condescension of Christ as God: Namely these, I freely acknowledge that the Condescension of Christ as Man, is not to be compared with his Condescension consider'd as GOD. And again, It must be granted that Christ, as God, gave the most glorious Demonstration of Love and Compassion to Apostate Mankind; in that the Deity's uniting the Humane Nature to it self, was unspeakably more marvellous, than all that Christ did, or could do as Man.

3. I observe that both the Natures having their parts in Man's Redemption, they must be understood accordingly, to be in this respect distinguished in the Holy Scripture, as they are by his Lordship: Some Scriptures relating more properly to the One, and some to the Other. For though they still represent the two Natures, as in inseparable Union, yet we cannot understand them, as attributing to the Divinity any thing unapplicable thereunto, or unworthy of it; such as grievous Sufferings, and Death it self, otherwise than as personally united with the Humanity. And though the Apostle Exhorts to feed the Church of God, which he has purchased with his own Blood; he could not mean it otherwise than,

than, as God-Man purchased the Church with the Blood which was his own as *Man*. And to speak of the *Blood of God* unqualifiedly, and without its due meaning, must sound both harshly and horridly, in the Ears of those, who have not a most gross Notion of the Deity.

4. I cannot therefore but farther observe, That if the Bishop may seem to an Unwary Reader (and he must be an Unwary one indeed to whom it can) to lay too great a stress upon the Merit of Christ as *Man*, in our Redemption, his Adversary may be justly thought to run into the other Extreme; and not to give him as *Man*, so willingly and freely laying down his Life, and so humbling himself for our sakes, the high Merit of Honour, that is most apparently his due; he still referring all he did, and suffered for our Salvation, to the Eternal *Logos*, confusedly putting all together, and making them to be swallow'd up wholly in the impassible and unchangeable Divinity. Which is much more like *Eutychism*, or *Monothelism*, than is his Lordships Doctrine, any thing a-kin to *Arianism*, or *Nestorianism*.

A 4 Secondly,

Secondly, I come to shew, though very briefly, the *Excellency* of this Doctrine, and what noble Ends and Purposes it serveth. It is said in the beginning of this *Defence*, that the Doctrine of *the Descent of the Man-Christ-Jesus from Heaven*, doth greatly illustrate the Excellency of his Person, and our Obligation to him, as *Man*. And what is more evident, than that it giveth us the most transcendent Idea of his Humane Soul imaginable; as not only speaking it to be created in Heaven, in an unspeakably glorious State, before the Foundation of *this* World, but also to be indued with the highest Perfection of the Divine Graces: Particularly of Love to God; of Charity and Compassion; of Humility and Self-Resignation. His Love to God being demonstrated to be so wonderfully powerful, as to make him not only *absolutely* Obedient to his Will, but *gladly* to comply with it, when he signified how pleasing it would be to him, that he should descend into this lowest Region, from the inexpressible Glory and Happiness he enjoy'd with himself; and moreover take an Earthy Body in the place of his Robe of Glory; and go through Infancy, Childhood and Youth, before his arriving at complete Man-

Manhood ; and be a *Man of Sorrows*, have all the infirmities of this State, Sin excepted ; be in the most despicable Circumstances, endure the greatest Afflictions, the sharpest Pains both of Body and Mind, and at last dye the worst of Deaths : And all this, in order to his being the Redeemer of the Apostate Race of Mankind from Eternal Death ; and to their complete Recovery of the Divine Image, and their arriving at Perfect and Immortal Blessedness. 'Tis impossible to comprehend the Greatness of that Love to God, and Charity also to Men, and that Profoundness of Humility and Self-denial, which made our Saviour so freely, and even, as I now said, *gladly*, as we learn from the *Psalmist* and *St. Paul*, (as the Bishop shews) he did, to submit to all this. And therefore well may we, with his Lordship, conceive God the Father, to express his being infinitely pleas'd herewith, by personally uniting such a Soul to his Eternal Son ; he likewise hereby making him capable of performing all those mighty, those most Divine things, which were necessary to his being the most perfect Saviour.

It would be but a vain Expende of time, to use more Words, to prove that this Doctrine

ctrine of the Bishops, (rather this Ancient Primitive Doctrine, and first taught as plainly by Christ himself as Words could do it) doth admirably illustrate farther the Excellency of our Saviour's Humane Soul or Person as *Man*. So that as it serves the most noble Purpose, in relation to *him*, it doth the same with respect to *us*, as it greatly heightens the Sense of our Obligation to the *Man-Jesus*, and excites to higher Degrees of Honour for him, and Love to him. These things are pressed so home by the Bishop, that tho' the Eyes of many may be a while dazled with the breaking in of what was to *them* a new Light, having never before consider'd this Doctrine; and tho' the most are, I had almost said, *fatally* overpower'd by the Prejudices of Education, &c. I cannot but greatly hope that it will be continually gaining ground: As nothing is better known than that there must be time allowed for the general embracing of Noble and Profitable Theory's, after they have been made out with the greatest strength and clearness. The Examples of this are so many, that none need to be instanced in.

It would be but a vain Expense of more Words, to prove that this Doctrine is

Thirdly,

Thirdly, I proceed to represent and further confirm, the *Grounds* of this Doctrine. Which having done, I shall, according to my Promise, insist upon Proofs out of the *Old Testament*.

I. This Doctrine of the *Descent of the Man-Christ-Jesus from Heaven*, is founded upon many plain and positive Texts of Holy Scripture.

I will not enlarge too much, upon what has been sufficiently represented by his Lordship: Only there are two or three Scriptures I crave leave to open a little more fully.

The *First* of them shall be *John 6. 38.* *I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me.* That this is not spoken by our Saviour as the Eternal Son of God, is demonstrable at first sight: For his Will must of necessity be the same with that of the Father. He could never say that he came down from Heaven, not to do his own Will; and it would be as harsh to apply to the Divine *Logos*, who is with the Father Co-eternal and Co-equal, what follows, *but the Will of him that sent me.* These Expressions are proper to the Humane Nature,

ture, or Pre-existing Soul of Christ in Heaven, but neither the coming down locally, nor the not doing his own Will, in point of either his teaching, mighty Works, or Sufferings, are at all applicable to the Eternal Logos. And hereto I add these other Scriptures, *John 7. 16, 18. My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. He that speaketh of himself, seeks his own Glory.* And *Chap. 14. 10. The Words that I speak unto you, I speak not of my self, but my Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the Works.* Can these Words sound well, out of the Mouth of God, the second Person of the Trinity?

The Second place shall be, *Phil. 2. 5, &c.* where Christ is propounded to us, as an illustrious Example of *Humility, Obedience and Charity.* And *this*, as a *Man*, not as *God*. For, having spoken first of the glorious Condition he was in, and how that he was in the *Form of God*; or in regard of his Union, as is agreed among us, *real God*; the Apostle saith next that he *emptied*, or greatly humbled himself, *and was made in the likeness of Men*, or of the *Sons of Adam, Earthy Men*; by which all the Orthodox understand, his Descent and Incarnation; nay, and not only *thus*,
but

but he became Obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross. All which is highly agreeable to Christ, as *Man*, and to our present *Hypothesis*. And all follows with an even and intire Thread from first to last; but is impossible to be applied to the *Divine* Nature, to the *Logos*, any otherwise than as Christ's Soul is in Union with him. Which Union was a most glorious Grace, and Condescention indeed, but he is not upon *that*, to be drawn by any as an Example to *us*, of profound Humility and Obedience, or to all that is spoken of our Saviour Christ as *Man*. And that this is demonstratively true, it follows, *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name, &c.* Than which to Christ as a *Man*, (and in the *Bishop's* Sense) nothing can be more applicable. But nothing less can be so to him as the *Eternal Word*, equal with the Father; and therefore sure, incapable of any Diminutions, or Reward. It seems strange and monstrous, so much as to *think* of these things, with respect to the Infinite and Eternal *Logos*.

And a better Comment in part, cannot I think be given on this place, than in the Words of the *same* Apostle, relating to this

this Matter, 2 Cor. 8. 9. *For you know the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that tho' he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his Poverty (Descent from Heaven, his Exinanition of himself, and Sufferings) might be rich.* See this Text excellently opened and apply'd, by the Bishop.

My last place shall be that most noted one, *John 17. 4, 5. I have glorified thee on Earth, I have finished the Work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with thine own self; with the Glory which I had with thee before the World, or this lower World was.* The Translation is plain, and the Original plain; and, if we will not be over Critical and Wise, how can we doubt their being spoken by our Saviour as *Man*, or of their carrying this plain Sense with them? *viz. I have (leaving Heaven and all the Glory I was possessed of there) glorified thee on Earth. I have finished the Work which thou gavest me to do: Or I have been born into the World, preached the Gospel, wrought innumerable Miracles for the confirmation thereof; and exemplified my Doctrine by my Life; and am just concluding all thou hast appointed me to do, by dying on the*
Cross.

Cross. *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with thine own self, or restore me to the Glory I had with thee before my coming hither, &c.*

That the *Eternal Word* is not to be understood as speaking these Words, *as the Eternal Word*, I know of but *one* that will not grant: And *he* has minted such a Notion upon this Text as may well be called an *Original*. Enough of which may be seen, in the *Brief Vindication* of the Bishop of Gloucester, as well as in the *Reflections* of his Lordship.

The more usual Exposition of this place is, that Christ in his Humane Nature prays to be Partaker of that Glory, which in the Divine Nature he had from Eternity in Heaven. But I need not insist on the forcedness of this Gloss. As it is evidently the Prayer of Christ as in the *Human* Nature; so it relates as evidently to a Glory which was once belonging thereto, and which he left upon his coming into this World; and prays now upon his return from hence, to be re-assumed and restored to it.

As for Grotius's Sense, *viz. Which I had with thee in thy Counsel and Decree*, it will by no means be allowed by the generality

nerality of Interpreters. They plead earnestly against him, that *μαγε σοι which I had with thee*, doth and must import an actual Possession. Thus the Learned Dr. *Whitby*, after many other: And thus the Learned Dean of *St. Paul's*, with earnestness and smartness, in his last Book against the *Socinians*, p. 150. But the Sense now given is so easie, and natural, that I cannot imagine what but want of being acquainted with the Notion defended by the Bishop, or a too unaccountable Prejudice to it, could occasion any other Exposition of the Words.

To conclude then the present Head: The Scriptures expressing the Man-Christ-Jesus's coming down from Heaven, or else most apparently implying it, are numerous and plain: So plain, that were the Doctrine never so undoubted, they need not to be plainer. Nor do they, as so understood, contradict any other Scripture, or sound Reason, or part of our Religion; but, as will be shewn, are very highly agreeable unto all of them. And therefore, we lay hold of Dean *Sherlock's* Rule (which is the common one) p. 50. of his now cited Book, *viz. That we never have recourse to a strained*

a strained and metaphorical Sense, but when we know that the nature of the thing will not admit of a proper and natural one. Which is infinitely far from being the Case in our present Point. And I apply to our Doctrine those Words of his, p. 39. Let any Man try whether he can invent more express Words to signifie it by, than what are used in Scripture; and then judge of the reasonableness (as I chuse to soften his Expression) of some, whom the most plain and express Words cannot convince. And I cannot but add what he saith, p. 155. Can any Man desire, or is it possible to have, a more certain proof of the true Sense of Scripture, than the easie and natural agreement of such variety of Expressions in the same Sense, which agree in no other Sense; and which the greatest force and violence can make no other probable Sense of? And he complains, p. 87. What work Men may make with Scripture, when they forsake the plain natural Sense of the Words, for remote, obscure and unnatural Metaphors, for no other reason but to serve an Hypothesis. Once more, he saith p. 50. We must understand Words in a proper and natural Sense, where there is no apparent reason for a Figure. A is or who is the Father of the Church, who is the Father of the Church, who is the Father of the Church. And

And here I dare appeal to the *Kulgar* generally, and to all those who never trouble their Heads with *Systems*, or *Sentimentaries*, but are satisfied to take the whole of their Faith from the plain Words of Scripture; Whether they conceive any Notion of a Figure in the Account of Christ's coming down from Heaven, any more than they do in that of his being ascended into Heaven: Or than they do, when they read of Moses his going up upon, and coming down again from the Mount; Or, indeed, than they do, when they are told of any Man's being gone to such a place, and return'd: Even as the honest plain Disciples of our Lord understood him, when he told them, That he came forth from the Father, and was come into the World, and was again leaving the World and going to the Father, saying, *Now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no Proverb, and Parable; or, if you please, no Figure.*

Nothing is more common in our Preaching, than magnifying the Love of God, in sending Christ into the World, and the Love of Christ, in the Scripture-Expressions, of his Coming down from Heaven for our sakes, of his Descending first into the lower parts of the Earth, who is Ascended
 bna into

into Heaven; of his being made poor to make us rich, who was before rich, and in the most glorious State with his Father, before this World was.

Now May, I dare appeal to our People generally, whether they do not find themselves necessarily carried in their private Thoughts, to understand all these, with the like Expressions, without any Figure; or according to their obvious and natural Sense: Whether they can imagine, while left to themselves, that such Expressions should need a Figure, any more than any other in the Bible? And sure I am, that the applying of these, with the other of the same Nature, to the Person of God, otherwise than as in Union with the Man Jesus, would make strange work with the Sense of our common Hearers, should they attend to it; as I question whether any of them do.

Secondly, This Doctrine of the Pre-existence of Christ's Soul, seems most congruous, or requisite, for the voluntary and free consent of the Man Christ, in all that he was to undertake and suffer for our Redemption. It seems highly reasonable, that he who was to undergo so much for it, should not be taken only from his Child-

hood passively into this mighty Work; and afterwards consent thereto upon a Revelation of his being *born* for this purpose. It looks most likely and besitting, that he should perfectly know the whole *before*, and as voluntarily accept it from the Father. And so by this means, from both his own free Mind, and a most compassionate and charitable Principle, undertake from the very first the fulfilling of the Divine Pleasure, being thereupon capacitated for the whole of it, by being in an un-conceivable manner united to the second Person in the Deity.

Doth not this most seem to be that, which he professeth in general of himself, *John* 10. 17, 18. *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No Man taketh my life from me, or against my free consent, but I lay it down of my self, or of my own choice, and voluntary engagement, &c.* This I propose to be well consider'd by all free and ingenuous Minds; by all who would not in the least derogate for a World, from the Honour of their Blessed Mediator, the *Man-Christ-Jesus*.

Thirdly, To advance a little farther up this Argument, I observe next, that there

bood

was

was a Covenant with Mankind, a solemn grand Covenant, from the beginning, as the Excellent Dr. Scot has prov'd. And, besides what is said in the 3d of *Genesis*, the Holy Scriptures speak of the Grace and Mercy, the Myſtery and Appointment, the Promise, nay, and Gift of God in Chriſt, not only *from*, but even *before*, the foundation of the World; as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew. And, as there was a Covenant very early commenced, ſo the ſame learned Perſon farther proves, that Chriſt was in like manner from the beginning, the Mediator of it. That it was founded upon the Sacrifice of his Blood; and his *Bond*, as it were, was given to fulfil the ſame in due time. And in virtue of this Sacrifice, were all the Benefits of the Covenant derived upon the World, from the beginning of it to that Day. Now *this* being the Caſe, how reaſonable doth it appear, that the Soul of Chriſt, or Humanity of the *Meſſiah*, that was to ſuffer, ſhould be then in being, and conſent to all. The voluntary conſent of the Man-Chriſt-Jeſus, ſaith one, is allowed by all as neceſſary, to the making his unmerited Sufferings for us juſt. And this conſent of his ſhould then in all reaſon be before the

Christian Covenant began. It is prov'd by Dr. Scot, and allow'd by most learned Men, that the *Logos* was originally concerned therein; but it is much more Congruous to understand this also of the *Humane Nature*, in conjunction with *him*; which was afterwards to be so highly concern'd in, both the Redemption and Government of Mankind.

Beside, this would make the Covenant, that was to be at length confirmed by Blood, to be for the space of Four Thousand Years, without any proper, suitable Mediator on *Man's* part; and if it be said, with some from certain Texts, that *this* was *Christ*, meaning the bare *Logos*: I answer, with the Bishop, First in the Words of *Grotius*, That *Christ* is *Nomen Hominis, the Name of a Man*; Or rather of a *God-Man*; Or, as *Tertullian* speaks, it is *Vocabulum nature humane*, a Word which includes the *Humane Nature* in it; which cannot belong to the abstracted *Logos*; and much less, since the Sacrifice belongs to that Title; and except we suppose this *Christ* to be *Theanthropos*, could there be a propitiatory bloody Atonement for the Sins of the World. But, in the Second place, I say also, that, as *God* only, *Christ* could not be

be a suitable Mediator between God and Man; for as much as that then God only in effect would Mediate with himself, there being an inseparable Oneness, and Co-eternal Unity, as well as Trinity in the God-head. But, as this Covenant of the Gospel, or of God in Christ, includes in the very Theory, or Nature of it, two Parties, viz. God and Man, so the Title of Mediator in this Covenant seems necessarily to require something on Man's part. St. Paul saith, *A Mediator is not one, but God is one.* Or a Mediator is not only of one Party, but God is one only. And farther, otherwise the Mediator would be of one Nature to the very end of the Law, and of another, or of a double Nature, since the times of the Gospel.

But the Scriptures are express on the other side. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a Ransom for all, 1 Tim. 2. 5. That is, who came down from Heaven, to give his Flesh, or himself, a Sacrifice, for the Life of the World. As he speaks, John 6. 51. It is remarkable that this one Mediator is particularly call'd the Man Christ Jesus, that the Human Nature may appear to be first

nally concern'd in the Mediatorship. And if he be *thus* the Mediator of the Covenant now, he must *always* have been so. But more of this afterwards.

Fourthly, I proceed to observe, that 'tis certain the *Ancient Jews* (to say nothing of the *present*. See the *State of the Jews in Barbary*, &c. Chap. 3.) did hold the Pre-existence of all Humane Souls; and therefore of their *Messiah*, and expected him from the upper World. And the Bishop has produced Traditions of theirs very home to our last Point. The Learned Dean needed not in such a scorn to have termed and rejected them as Rabbinical Tales, since they are called so by the Bishop himself. Yet finding such things among them, they were most proper to be taken notice of by him, as very remarkable to his Purpose. They evidently shew the Sense of the Ancient Jewish Church; and that they had a Tradition, not only of the Pre-existence of their *Messiah's* Soul, but also of his *accepting* in the other State, the Terms upon which he was to Atone for, and Redeem Mankind. God is brought in, as saying to the Soul of the *Messiah*, *Wilt thou heal and redeem my Sons after 6000 Years?* He answered, *I am willing so to do.* Again
God

God said to him, *And art thou willing to suffer Chastisements for the purging away of their Iniquities?* And the Soul of the *Messiah* answered, *I will suffer them, and that right gladly.* See the Bishop's Discourse, p. 26, 27. And the Notion of the Pre-existence of the *Messiah's* Soul, the Dean might if he had pleas'd, have endeavour'd to confute; or, at least have said something to it.

Fifthly, I come now to our grand Point, viz. The Proof of our Doctrine out of the Old Testament. And, in the first place, from the numerous Appearances to the ancient Patriarchs: viz. *Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, &c.* And that these were Appearances of the *Logos*, is commonly conceived by the Learned; and is very frequently to be found among the *Fathers*. Infomuch that Dr. Scot in his *Excellent Christian Life, Part 2. Vol. 2. Chap. 7. and Sect 7.* undertakes to shew, That as the Kingdom of Christ was founded upon the New Covenant, immediately after the Fall of Man, so from the very beginning of the whole, Christ was the Mediator, and the King of it; and accordingly govern'd all along, under the most High God and Father, that ancient Church and People of the *Jews*. And in the making out of this great

great Point, he sets himself to evince the following Propositions.

1. That there was a certain extraordinary Angel, who frequently appear'd, and spake to the Jewish Patriarchs; who is sometimes call'd Jehovah, and sometimes the Angel of Jehovah; who ordinarily assum'd to himself Divine Appellations; and to whom those Holy Men ordinarily render'd Divine Honour, Vows and Sacrifices.

2. That this extraordinary Angel was a Divine Person, and no Created Being.

3. That he was that Divine Person, that descended upon Mount Sinai; and from thence removed into the Tabernacle; and thence into the Temple.

4. That this Divine Person was not God the Father.

5. That he was God the Son.

The Doctor makes out these Points excellently; yet more might be added, if need were, for the farther proving and establishing of them.

Now it seems most harsh to make this God the Son by himself to appear in an Human Shape, visit, eat and drink, wrestle and converse with Men after such a manner.

her. How can this suit with the Eternal Word, or Naked Divinity? Doth it not seem infinitely too low a thing, for the Infinite, All-comprehending Majesty of God to submit unto?

But if we understand it of the *Soul of Christ*, in the hypostatical Union with the Eternal Son of God, who was afterwards to be the *Word made Flesh*, or *God manifested in the Flesh*; and these Manifestations or Appearances in an Humane Figure, to be *praludiums* thereof, we shall not look upon all this as hard to be conceived. Particularly, that he should so long converse with *Abraham* as a Man, who was afterward, and at the same time, call'd *Jehovah*. That as a Man, or Angel, he should vouchsafe to wrestle with *Jacob*; and be call'd accordingly first a Man, and afterward acknowledg'd and ador'd as God. That *Gen. 31. 11.* it should be first said, *The Angel of God spake unto me in a dream, &c.* and presently *v. 13.* it should follow from the Mouth of this Angel, *I am the God of Bethel, where thou anointed'st the Pillar, &c.* That sometimes it should be said, that God appear'd to *Moses* in the Bush; and at other times that an Angel did. Sometimes that God went before them in the Pillar

Pillar of the Cloud and of Fire; and at other times that an *Angel* did. Nay, of the delivery of the Law from *Mount Sinai*, it is not only said that *God* gave it to them, but by the *Apostle*, that it was given by the disposition of *Angels*. And he is call'd the *Angel* who spake to *Moses* in *Mount Sinai*. And the like is to be observ'd in *Jacob's* Benediction of the two Sons of *Joseph*, *Gen.* 48. 15, 16. In the *Captain* of the Host of the *Lord* that appear'd to *Joshua*, *Chap.* 5. 13, &c. And so also I think (tho' some have question'd it) in that Extraordinary Man, who appear'd to *Manoah* and his Wife, *Judg.* 13. For what tho' he seemingly refus'd the Sacrifice, in saying, *It must be offer'd to the Lord*; it is but like that Expression of *Christ* in the Gospel, *Why callest thou me good, there is none good but One that is God?* To besure what afterwards follows, *Why askest thou thus after my Name, seeing it is secret*, or (as 'tis in the Margin) *wonderful*, one of the Titles of *Christ*? *Isaiah* 9. 6. (as 'tis said to *Jacob* also by that *God-Angel*, *Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my Name?* *Gen.* 32. 29.) I say this and his doing so wondrously before them, and *Manoah* and his Wife falling on their Faces to the ground, plainly shew that he

was

was more than an ordinary Angel. And it follows, ver. 22. that Manoah said to his Wife, *we shall surely dye, because we have seen God.* Like Chap. 6. 22. Gen. 32. 30. and some other places.

But let this be doubted as it will, I think there is no difficulty, as to the Angel that rebuked the People at Bochim, Judg. 2. 1. He is call'd an *Angel*, or Messenger, and yet he speaks in the language of the Lord *Jehovah*, viz. *I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the Land which I swear unto your Fathers, &c.* who should this be but the God-Angel, the Prince and Mediator of the Covenant, that spake with their Fathers, and conducted them all along from Egypt to Canaan?

So also Chap. 6. 12, &c. it is said first, *And the Angel of the Lord appeared unto Gideon, &c.* but v. 14. not the *Angel of the Lord*, but the *Lord* look'd upon him, &c.

And considering all Circumstances, it seems highly probable, that 'twas this same Divine Angel that appear'd thrice to Hagar, and comforted her. As first in Gen. 16. 10. where it is thus expressed, *I will multiply thy Seed exceedingly, &c.* See also v. 13. where it is said, *And she called the*

Name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou
 God seest me. The next Passage is Chap.
 21. v. 13. where God speaks to Abraham
 thus, And also of the Son of the Bond-
 woman will I make a Nation, &c. And
 then v. 17, 18. we read thus, And God
 heard the voice of the Lad, and the Angel
 of God called to Hagar out of Heaven, and
 said unto her, what aileth thee Hagar?
 Fear not, &c. Arise, lift up the Lad, and
 hold him in thine Hand, for I will make
 him a great Nation. The Words of God to
 Abraham before: And it follows, And God
 opened her Eyes, &c.

That Angel of the Lord who appear'd
 to Balaam in the way with a drawn Sword,
 is prov'd by Dr. Scot to be the same with
 this God-Angel, the Logos. See p. 243.
 And we find in Zachariah 3. 1, 2. the same
 Person again call'd both the Angel of the
 Lord, and the Lord, or Jehovah, himself.
 And he shewed me Joshua the High-Priest
 standing before the Angel of the Lord, and
 Satan standing at his right hand to resist
 him. And 'tis then presently said, And the
 Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebukes
 thee O Satan, even the Lord that hath cho-
 sen Jerusalem, &c. And v. 6. we again
 read, That the Angel of the Lord protested
 unto

unto Joshua, saying, thus saith the Lord of Hosts, &c. Where 'tis to be observ'd, that this Extraordinary Angel is not only call'd *Jehovah* at the same time, but also spake of another Divine Person, viz. the First.

Now this, and all the foregoing Passages, are easily to be accounted for, upon the supposition, that they are to be understood of the Soul of the *Messiah* united with the the Divine *Logos*; but by no means otherwise.

We will go back to Passages from the very beginning, and see how they comport with the Hypothesis we are upon. This will give a good Account of those Divine Apparitions and Manifestations we read of in the 1st. of *Genesis*: Of those Conferences there with our first Parents; and of that Expression God so often repeated, *Let us make Man in our likeness; in the Image of God created he him.* And why should not this have respect to not only his Divine, or Intellectual Likeness, but also to the Form which Christ as *God-Man*, was in? This is agreeable to what is afterwards said, *of their hearing the voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden, in the cool of the Day.* And so, to all

all the after familiar Apparitions of this kind.

And it will not be amiss to take notice, of what we find offer'd by the foremention'd very Learned and Excellent Author, in his *Apology* annex'd to his *Mystery of Iniquity*. Which, however it met with some sharp and haughty Animadversions in almost all its other parts, had the good luck to escape them altogether as to the present Subject. He shews in his second Chapter: That in respect of Christ, God may in some Sense be said to have the Humane shape. And also 2. in regard of his so frequent appearing in the Humane Shape in the Old Testament, before the Incarnation. 3. That these Apparitions were ordinarily the Appearing of the Son of God, and certain Productions to his Incarnation, according to the Sense of the Fathers. 4. That it is not irrational to admit that God was actually in the Humane Shape, when he Created Adam: And how triumphantly confident Eugubinus is thereof.

I will give some of the Author's Words more at large. In the third Paragraph of this Chapter, he writes thus: But in what Sense God may be said to have an Humane Shape, cannot be unknown to us, who call
 our

our selves Christians, and do acknowledge Christ to be *Θεὸς ὁμοῦς*, both God and Man. For thus the Humane Shape is his Shape, and his Shape (for he has made it his by assuming it to himself) our Shape; and so we were created according to that very Shape, which God designed to appropriate to himself in the Incarnation of the Eternal Word. Insomuch that this literal Text may seem to bear along with it the Nature of a Typical Prophecy, and an early Pre-intimation of the Incarnation of Christ.

He shews likewise how Molinæus and Calvin, upon some Passages of Scripture, do both concur in this Sentiment. And if this Author has not here so absolutely, as might be, applied it to Christ, then made up of the two Natures, and at that time united, he has sufficiently done it in other places. Particularly, where he calls Christ in his Humane Nature, happily before the Generation of Men, and Peopling of the Earth, as it were the Messiah Elect, united also with the Logos, and resplendent with Cœlestial Glory and Beauty among the Angels in Heaven. And how he he was concern'd in flaming the World in which we live, and the Government of the

see Myste-
ry of God-
liness, Lib.
1. Cap. 8.

Regions of Heaven and Earth, is more a large to be seen in his Exposition of the *Merchaves* and *Catechism* annex'd, Vol. *Philosop.* Tom. I. P. 478, &c. See also *Div. Dialogues*; viz. *Dial. 4. §. 12.*

To Establish from hence the gross Doctrine of the *Anthropomorphites*, as was done by some of Old, is exceeding absurd, as it was most rashly done in others, to lay it to the Charge of the Reverend Doctor. But to conceive, as he doth, that this was all this time the Complex Person of Christ, the *Deus Figuratus*, as he is and may be justly call'd, and who was particularly concern'd about this Habitable Globe, from the beginning, will appear, if all things be well consider'd, highly rational, and gives the best Account of those foremention'd Scripture-Phænomena.

I might add some pregnant Passages of the most Learned and Ingenious Mr. *Whiston*, relating to this Point, in his *New Theory of the Earth*; but I refer the Reader to them. And I pray him to consider well his Observation to this Purpose, That the Name of *Angel*, or *Messenger*, with diverse things mention'd in Scripture, as condescended to by this Divine Person, would never have been attributed to the
Eternal

Eternal Logos, if he had not been then in Union with the Soul of the Messiah. They would not have been at all agreeable with the Majesty of the Son of God essentially consider'd; but debase too much the Divine Nature, and intrench upon the Honour of its most glorious Perfections. But understanding those things of the *Scriptures*, the Soul of the Messiah in the Union; this is a choice Key for the opening of much Scripture of both Testaments. And so of the Mystery of our Redemption, and the Government of the World from the Beginning to the End.

It may be worth our while to observe, how he, whose Apparitions are so plentifully recorded, is represented in other places, besides those mention'd, as appearing in a Humane Figure. As Exod. 24. 10. it is said of Moses and Aaron, &c. That they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his Feet, as it were the paid work of a Sapphire Stone, and as it were the Body of Heaven in its cleanness. 1 Kings 22. 19. It is said by the Prophet Michaiab, I saw the Lord sitting on his Throne, and all the Host of Heaven standing by him, on his right hand, and on his left. I saw also, saith Isaiah, the Lord sitting on his Throne,

high and lifted up, and his Train fill'd the Temple. Chap. 6. 1. And this is aply'd to Christ; John 12. 41. These things said Esaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him. So in Ezekiel's Vision, Chap. 1. 26. we have these Words, Upon the likeness of the Throne was the likeness, as the appearance of a Man above upon it. In the Prophecy of Daniel, we meet with divers Appearances of this God-Angel in the Figure of a Man. The form of the Fourth Man walking in the midst of the burning fiery Furnace, is said to be like to the Son of God, Chap. 3. 25. Him the Ancients suppose to be Christ; particularly Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hyppolytus Martyr, Augustine, with others. Him whom the Winds, saith one, and Seas obeyed in the Flesh, the Fire here obeys in a Humane Form preludious to it.

So by Calvin and others, Christ is conceiv'd to be signified under the name Palmony, Chap. 8. 13. And to be that commanding Man, ver. 15, 16. And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the Vision, and sought for the meaning; then behold there stood before me as the appearance of a Man. And I heard a Man's voice between the Banks of Ulai, which called and said, Gabriel, make this Man to understand

understand the Vision. And Chap. 16. 5. saith Daniel, *Then I lift up mine Eyes, and looked, and behold a certain Man cloathed in Linnen, whose Loins were girt with fine Gold of Uphaz. His Body also was like the Beril, and his Face as the appearance of Lightning, and his Eyes as Lamps of Fire, and his Arms and his Feet like in colour to polish'd Brass; and the voice of his Words like the voice of a Multitude.* Who should this be but the Lord Christ, and especially when he is near throughout so described in the *Apocalypse*, Chap. 1. 13, &c.

Lastly, *The Man*, as he is call'd, *cloathed in Linnen*, Dan. 12. 7. *which was up on the Waters of the River; lifting up his Hand to Heaven, and swearing by him that liveth for ever*, very well answers to that mighty and glorious Angel describ'd *Apoc. 10. 1, &c.* who swore with the same Ceremony in the same form, v. 5, 6, viz. *Lifting up his Hand to Heaven, by him that liveth for ever and ever.* And the best Interpreters do conclude this to be the Lord Christ.

I again take notice how this Angel of the Lord went before the Israelites in a *Pillar of a Cloud, and of Fire*; travelled with them for the space of Forty Years in

the Wilderness, and took up his Residence among them, first in the Tabernacle, and afterward in the Temple. And *this* is by all acknowledg'd a Type of the *Incarnation* of the Son of God, and his dwelling, or *tabernacling* (as St. *John's* Word in the *Greek* signifieth) among us. And of whom it is said, That *he came to his Own, and his Own received him not.* And it must be own'd that the Type is still more complete upon the Hypothesis before us. And considering how he Tabernacled among us, and as a *Terrestrial* Man, a Son of *Adam*; no wonder that he should condescend before his Incarnation, to a Humane Shape, and attend as he did upon his *Own* all along, and was so conversant among them. But if *this* Mystery of the *Messiah* was not in it, and so of the *God-Man*, it appears, I say again, a strangely harsh thing to say of the *Eternal Word*, or Infinite Divinity, by it self consider'd, that he humbled himself to such things as those I have represented out of the Old Testament.

And that this was the *Messiah* or Christ the 68th Psalm, very fully sheweth: As ver. 6, 7, 8. O God, when thou wentest forth before thy People, when thou didst march through the Wilderness, the Earth shook,
the

the Heavens also dropped Water at the presence of God, even Sinai it self was mov'd at the presence of God, the God of Israel. Of which God it follows, ver. 17. The Chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of Angels, the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the Holy Place. Which Words answer to the like Pompous ones, with which begins the Blessing of Moses before his Death, Dent 33. 2. viz. The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran; and he came with ten thousand of his Saints, (or Holy Angels); from his right Hand went a fiery Law for them. Yea he loved his People, &c. And to complete all, of this Lord God of Israel, it follows in that Psalm, ver. 18. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led Captivity Captive, thou hast receiv'd Gifts for Men, yea for the Rebellious also (the Gentiles as well as Jews) that the Lord God might dwell among them. And that all this is spoken in a Prophetical Rapture of Christ, is most evident from St. Paul's applying these last Words to him, Eph. 4. 8. Even to Christ in his Humane as well as Divine Nature, as appears from what follows, ver. 9, 10. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended

ded first, into the lower parts of the Earth? He that descended, is the same also that ascended up far above all Heavens. See my Lord's Discourse, p. 18, 19, 20. What but a strong Pre-Possession can withstand the force of this Proof of the Man-Christ-Jesus his Descent from Heaven? See also his Reflections, p. 29, 30.

And weighing well what has been said, how can we doubt but that this same Christ, whole Christ, was meant, in those Words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. I. 4. And that Rock was Christ. And in v. 9. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them (the murmuring Israelites) also tempted, or tempted him; as 'tis in several Copies: And in Heb. II. 26. where 'tis said, that Moses esteemed the Reproaches of Christ, (or for Christ) as greater Riches than the Treasures of Egypt. And whose voice is that of (which it is said, it shook the Earth, (viz. at the giving of the Law upon Mount Sinai) Chap. 12. 26. but the voice of Jesus, v. 24. the Mediator of the New Covenant, &c. 9. And his Blood is next mention'd, as speaking better things than the Blood of Abel. And lastly, Who is that Jesus Christ, that is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever, Heb. 13. 8. Which yesterday must take
 in

in the times of the Old Testament : And well might he say, Even as he is God-Man, *I am Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last*, Apocal. 1. 11. See Chap. 1. & 21. 6. compar'd with *Isaiab* 4. 46. Even *I Jesus Christ*, the same that liveth and was dead; the Faithful witness, and the First begotten of the Dead, and the Prince of the Kings of the Earth : He that loved us, and washed us from our Sins with his own Blood. This shews how the Humane Nature is here mixed all along, and concern'd jointly with the Divine. And it is certain, that as God-Man, or as the *Man-Christ-Jesus*, he will come to judge and to end the World. See *Acts* 17. 31. And as he ends at last, so why may he not also be very well suppos'd in Union with the *Logos*, to make and begin the World; or to be concern'd in the first forming, as well as in the last destruction of it? We meet frequently in Scripture with such Expressions as these; *Who verily was foreordain'd before the foundation of the World, but was made manifest in these last Days for us*, 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. And the Grace of God is said to be given us in *Christ Jesus*, (that is actually, I think, as to its first preparation) before the World began, 2 *Tim.* 2. 9. In like manner Eter-
nal

nal Life is said to be *promis'd by him before the World was*, Tit. 1. 2. i. e. actually promis'd, and before this *lower World* was; before the formation of the *Terrestrial World*, and what belongs to it. For it seems to be somewhat strange otherwise, and derogatory not a little at first sight to the Wisdom, Goodness and Glory of God, in the Creation of the entire Universe at large, to suppose, that even antedecedaneous unto this, a Saviour was thus formally and solemnly appointed for the Souls of Men, before they were at all made; and as a *Salvo* to that Apostacy and Wretchedness, they would fall into. But to proceed.

Thus again, the *Ephesians* are said to be *chosen in Christ*, or made by the Divine Purpose a Part of his Church with many others, *before the foundation of the World*, Chap. 1. 4. And in 1 Cor. 2. 6. the Gospel is call'd *the hidden Wisdom of God*, that vail'd the mysterious, the secret Wisdom or Dispensation of the Father in Christ Jesus, *which God ordained before the World unto our Glory*. All which I parallel with that Glory, which our Saviour in his *Humane*, as well as *Divine Nature*, is said to have

have had before this lower World was, John 17. 5. and with that which follows, *For thou lovedst me (actually lovedst me) before the foundation of the World, v. 24.* Which is but a small thing for Christ to say as God, but great every way, and most suitable, to be spoken by him as *Man*; or according to his *Human* Præ-existing Nature. And this is all still the *Mystery kept secret since the World began*: And which was so long hid, as to the Knowledge of some great Particulars of it, *from Ages and from the Generations*, viz. As the Secret of the calling of the *Gentiles* to the Faith, so the Mystery of the Mediator, or of the Christian Covenant and Dispensation in general, according to the other places, as began and manag'd from, and even before, the Foundation of the World.

It is farther observable, how our Lord Christ, as he receiv'd his Kingdom as Mediator before the Foundation of the World, or is presum'd so to do, so when he hath done all, and fulfill'd all his Father's great Work and Pleasure, with respect to the Government and Redemption of it, as likewise judg'd it righteously, and put an end to the whole at the last Day; it follows, *Then cometh the End, when he shall have deliver'd*
 this W
 up

the Kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all Rule, and all Authority and Power. Namely, that is contrary to himself. For he must reign till he hath put all Enemies under his Feet. Which gives us, amongst other things (even innumerable others) the good hope of those better Times of the Church of God which are to come: When all Divine Knowledge, Righteousness, and Peace, shall more and more prevail; and Christ shall put down all Wicked, Pagan, or Antichristian Rule, Authority, and Power; since he must reign till he hath broke the Head of the old Serpent, and put all Enemies under his Feet.

Nay, it is moreover to be observ'd, that it follows still farther thus: And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him which put all things under him, that God may be all in all; or he shall resign, as it were, his White Staff, or his Commission; deliver up the Kingdom, the Government which he had receiv'd; having ended now the entire Counsell of the Eternal Father, in the World and Regions committed to his Charge; and there being no farther need now of any such Prince or Mediator.

Which

Which how applicable it is to our Lord Christ as *Man*, every one may perceive at first sight : But at the same time how unapplicable is it to the Ever Glorious Divinity of the *Word* ?

And to make the *Man-Christ-Jesus* still more sensible to us, as concern'd in Man's Redemption, as also how distinct and different from the *Logos*, at the same time that he is so closely united to him, I shall here hint to the Reader the Scriptures following. Christ is called by the Name of *Servant*. Behold my *Servant* whom I uphold ; my *Elect* in whom my Soul delighteth, Isa. 42. 1. So also Chap. 49. 6. Chap. 52. 13. and Chap. 53. 11. And in *Zechariah*, My *Servant the Branch*. And the *Man* whose Name is the *Branch*, Chap. 3. 8. and 6. 12. With more such Passages of this, and a like kind befitting the Humane, but not at all the Infinite and Eternal Nature of Christ. So far is the Humane Soul in Christ from being little or nothing, a sort of mere Abstract, and the Divine Word *all*, as it were, as the Dean sometimes seems to speak, in the Redemption and OEconomy of the Gospel.

Thus also in the New Testament we have abundance of Passages, such as these.

The

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the Poor, &c. Luke 4. 18. See also Acts 4. 27. And again, Anointed with the Oyl of Gladness above thy Fellows, Heb. 1. 9. What is it but all both Angelical and Humane Souls; his Brethren follows at large. And again, I seek not mine own Glory. If I honour my self, my honour is nothing, John 8. 50, 54. But more fully still, Heb. 5. 5, 7. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an High-Priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee. This is he, who, as it follows afterward, In the Days of his Flesh offer'd up Prayers and Supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from Death; and was heard in that he feared. Though he were a Son, (with respect to both his Temporal Generation as Man, and Eternal Generation as God: And sure neither of these either need or ought to be deny'd) yet learned he Obedience by the things which he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the Author of Eternal Salvation, &c.

When he cry'd so agonistically in the Garden, and on the Cross; when he was in that Trouble and Perplexity, John 12. 27.

What

What shall I say, Father, save me from this Hour? But for this cause came I unto this Hour, i. e. I, even in my Human Nature that is now so perplex'd, came from Heaven for this very purpose, that I should in this manner, and at this season, dye a Sacrifice upon the Cross, for the Sins of the World. So would I understand this place: However, that it is the distinct Human Nature, or Individual Soul of Christ, that here speaks, must be evident unto all. So Chap. 17. 2. As thou hast given him Power over all Flesh, &c. And thus all Power is elsewhere declared as very particularly given him, and by special Designation, as he was the Messiah, and the Man-Christ-Jesus, both in Heaven, and in Earth, i. e. in the Regions that belong to his Charge in Heaven, as well as here on Earth; Angels, and Authorities, and Powers, being made subject unto him. Which, sure, was no News concerning the Infinite and Eternal Logos. But it follows v. 23. And now I come to thee, was the Eternal Word ever from him? The Glory which thou gavest me, v. 22. Sure these things, I say, and the like, are all highly improper to be attributed to the Word, but no less absolutely and entirely applicable to the Suffering Humanity

manity of the Lord Jesus Christ; capable
 both of great *Glory*, and of great *Debase-
 ment*; of great *Humiliation*, and of as
 transcendent a State of *Exaltation*; equal
 to the Father, as touching his *Godhead*,
 and inferiour to the Father as touching his
Manhood. Perfect God, and perfect Man;
 of a Reasonable Soul, and Humane Flesh
 subsisting. Thus are both Natures evident
 and distinct. Thus is he absolutely Perfect
 as God, and Glorious as Man. A most
 noble, reasonable, and deify'd Soul he was,
 and is, possess'd of. And in short, it is by
 the *Man-Christ-Jesus*, thus united to the
Word, that the Father, Word, and Eter-
 nal Spirit save and redeem the World.
 To look back a while, and sum up to-
 gether the things that have been said,
 and the usefulness of them. It hath
 been prov'd as to the Main, by those two
 Reverend and Learned Persons, Dr. *Scot*
 and Dr. *Alix*, That 'twas not God the Fa-
 ther, nor yet the Eternal Spirit, that so
 spake and appear'd under the Old Testa-
 ment, but *Christ*, or, as they express it,
 the *Logos* or *Word*; that this gave the Law,
 spake to the Fathers, and the Prophets, &c.
 That the Covenant of the Gospel was from
 the beginning of the World, and Christ
 the

the Mediator of this Covenant : And that from hence also by consequence was the rise and progress of his Kingdom. And it hath frequently been shew'd, that the Opinion of the Antient *Fathers* was, that it was *Christ* or the *Logos* that did thus appear to the Ancient Patriarchs, gave the Law to the *Israelites*, and led them through the Wilderness into *Canaan*. *Non Pater in Rubo, non Pater in Eremo, sed Filius moysi locutus est.* It was not the *Father*, saith *St. Ambrose*, in the Bush, it was not the *Father* in the Wilderness, but it was the *Son* that spake to *Moses*. *St. Basil* also speaks to a like purpose. And *Irenæus* calls the *Son*, as do the Holy Scriptures themselves, *the maker of the Heavens and the Earth*: And then adds, *Who gave the Law by the Hand of Moses, and appear'd unto the Fathers.*

Now this being the Case, and things so far agreed, one may appeal unto the unprejudiced, whether all the Circumstances of the whole Matter consider'd, the humane Titles and Appearances of this *Logos* or *Christ*, with the Condescensions and Familiarities that are recorded of him; all that answers plainly in the New Testament unto the Old, with

with all the pregnant Testimonies that are in the Bishop's Treatise, for the *Pre-existence* of Christ in his Humane Nature, and *Descent* from Heaven; the beginning of the Gospel-Covenant from the very Fall of Man; nay, even from *before* the foundation of this World, and its having always had a Prince and Mediator; as it is the Nature indeed of such a Propitiatory Covenant that it should have: I say, let all things be consider'd, both these and the like, and I appeal to the unprejudiced, whether this Notion of the *Logos*, his being the Divine Person that all along appear'd and acted, be not much more compleat by the addition of the Humane Soul of Christ, at that time in Union with him, the Mediator of the Covenant in vertue of this Union, and so the famous *Messiah* that was to come, than *without* it. The whole Hypothesis is otherwise but a sort of a *half* Business; whereas this, when added to it, gives a natural Solution to many Mysteries and great Difficulties in both Testaments: Is an excellent confirmation of the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Divinity of our Blessed Lord and Saviour, and the Incarnation of the Word, or *entire Christ*.

It hath been observ'd by some, that in the First of *St. John*, there is no mention of Christ's Soul; only that the *Word was made Flesh*. But the Soul and Word being before united, there was no need of a particular express mention of it. And so also in *Heb. 10. 5.* it is only said, *Wherefore when he cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifice and Offering thou would'st not, but a Body hast thou prepared me.* There was no need to take express notice of the Soul, for it was that in Union with the Divine *Logos* which was to descend into it. And that Expression of the *Psalmist*, *Psal. 40. 6. Psa, thy Law is within my Heart, or in the midst of my Bowels,* is thought, with great Reason, not to be so applicable to the bare *Word*, as adapted to the *Humane Soul* or *Nature of Christ*. And what follows, *Then said I, Lo I come in the Volume of the Book it is writtten of me, to do thy Will O God,* it is suppos'd, and I think justly, to be the voice of the *Messiah*, with respect chiefly at least, to his *Humane Nature*, and that *Death* which he was to dye for the Sins of the World. And what *Sacred Volume* and *Record* (or, as *Dr. Scot* would have it translated, what *Indenture* or *Covenent*)

nant, in Heaven as well as Earth it may refer to, is above, I presume, our Knowledge to determine. Though 'tis sufficient to understand it of the Volume of *Moses*, or of the ancient *Law*.

And now it will be farther worth the while to consider what the Learned and great Author Dr. *Moor* speaks, with respect to *Spinoz*ius his Cavils, touching the Appearances of God to the ancient Patriarchs. He sucks, as he conceives, from that Topick, no *small advantage*: And catcheth greedily at a *Corporeal and Figur'd God*. But the impious Cavils, saith this Excellent Person, of this Writer from the frequent Appearances, and bodily Manifestations of God in Scripture, will all immediately vanish upon this one *Hypothesis*, that the God which appear'd to the Patriarchs was the Soul of the *Messiah*, join'd at that time with the Eternal *Logos*, and assuming unto himself Humane Figure. Whence since he was at once both truly God, and also, as he calls him, an *Ætherial Man*, he might on this account both be call'd God, as he generally is, and have those things at the same time attributed to him, and so names also, that are beneath Divinity, and do

do favour of the *Manhood*, as many *Passages* and *Appearances* of his do.

He farther carps at God's not being only said to have *Hands, Feet, Eyes, Ears, local Motion*, and the like, but also that various *Passions*, such as *Grief, Anger, Jealousie, Pity, Fury*, and such like, are attributed to him. All which as apply'd to the Divinity, are by the universal consent of Mankind, I am sure, the *understanding* part of it, *metaphorically* to be understood; and in a way of *Condescension* to our *Humane Faculties* and *Affections*. But if applied to Christ as *Man*, or to the Divine *Logos* in his *complex* State, they may be *literally* also understood. For it is no more than what happen'd to the *Messiah* in his State of *Incarnation*. And in his *Humane Soul* he might justly be said long before that, both to *descend* and *ascend*, to examine the State of *Sodom*, to be *angry, jealous, grieved* at his *very Heart*, and the like. We know how passionately he speaks in many places of Holy Scripture. So that on all these Accounts, the usefulness of the *Hypothesis*, which we here advance, is more and more illustrated. And that dull and gross *Heretic* of *Anthropomorphism* had sure never been so embraced, if this Do-

Crime had been duly or effectually understood. But as it is otherwise, they had in shew *some* Pleas for it. But I go on with *him* I before-mention'd.

Whereas he Notes again, that God is said to speak to *Moses* all along in the Law, but not to *Christ* in the Gospel; there is a very good Reason for this Change; since that Divine Person which spake still to *Moses*, and manag'd, though *incognito*, or after a mysterious manner, that preparatory Dispensation, was now *himself* on Earth, witnessed to sufficiently by both the Father and the Spirit, and establishing the new Dispensation of the Gospel.

And I am minded here of a Remark from a Learned and Honoured Friend of mine, several times refer'd to in these Papers, which I think of great moment, *viz.* That 'tis apparent, that there was in the Old Testament some very great and extraordinary *Angel*, which is frequently mention'd, distinguish'd from all other Angels whatsoever, and assuming Divine Power, Titles, and Worship unto himself: And as apparent, that there is no such Angel to be met with in the Writings of the New Testament; not amongst all the Angels, or extraordinary Appearances, which we there read

read of: A very shrewd Intimation, that there is a Mystery more than ordinary in it; and indeed, that Christ the *Theanthropos* was this *Angel*, or Divine Person so appearing, under a Vail, or mysterious Covert, but now incarnate since, and more openly as the *God-Man* manifested to the World.

And if any shall wonder at Christ's being call'd so often by the Name of an *Angel*, though he was not of the Angelical but Humane Order, we know that it may be properly a general Term for any Coelestial Spirit, whatsoever that God shall please to send on his Sacred Errands, he is his *Angel* or *Messenger*. And now what should this *God*, *Angel*, and *Man*; what should his Word and *Messenger*, mean all along in the *Old Testament*, this mixture of Names, Natures, and Actions, but the same with *Christ* or *God-Man* in the *New*? Why is he not always call'd *God*, or call'd *Angel*? And why such variety and seeming Confusion in this Matter? Or was not Christ as worthy to Rule the World, and as able too, before the Gospel, as after it? Or was this degenerate Globe of so much Consequence, for the whole Scene of Affairs upon it, as to be too great a thing for such

a Transcendent, Divine Person, a *Theanthropos*, to Rule and Govern it? It is in virtue of *his* Merits, Covenant, and Blood, that the true People of God are fav'd and accepted from first to last: He is the Head of the Church, and Saviour of the Body, from the beginning of the World unto the end of it, Which should argue that he was the great and *actual* Sponsor, and undertaker for it from the beginning. And who indeed so fit to judge all at the last Day, as he that hath known and rul'd all things from the very beginning?

Since Mankind needed a Mediator, and one that should undertake for them from the very first, what Absurdity or Incongruity is there in supposing, that from the very rise of all things he actually existed; and why should he not be the same also, and of a like sort, an entire Christ, from the rise of all things; rather what a Congruity is there, what a greater Concinnity in supposing it? And, as I have more at large argu'd, how much more requisite and decorous is it, that that Humane Nature of Christ which was to dye for the World, and so concern'd in the Covenant of Mediation for it, should undertake this originally of its free Choice and Will; and from a Principle of Divine Charity,

Charity, than that this Matter should be according to the vulgar Hypothesis? Which makes Christ's Soul to be Created, but at the time of his Incarnation; and so from thence forwards to be trained, as it were up, and fitted for his whole Work.

I should imagine, *saith one before-mentioned*, that the Hypostatical Union began with, and was founded upon the Humane Soul's voluntary consent, to undergo *the long and tedious Work* of the 6000 Years Government of Sinners, of a constant struggle against the Devil, and of the Redemption of Men by his Incarnation and Death.

I hope these things, when they are thus jointly consider'd, will have force enough to make this Doctrine a worthy and most Rational Doctrine. It makes all of a piece, leaves not things at once unnecessarily and unnaturally to the bare *Word* it self, in that ancient, whether legal or patriarchal Dispensation; separates not contrary to the Reason and Appearances of Scripture, Christ's Humane Nature from the Divine; by which he became the more fit Mediator from the beginning; and the glorious *Theanthropos* from end to end, for both the entire Government and Redemption of the World.

World. By which the Nature of Christ, and Truth of the Holy Trinity are open'd and confirm'd; the two Testaments illustrated, and both the Beginning and End of this lower World render'd suitable and harmonious unto one another.

As Christ's Government of the World becomes hence an entire thing, so all his different Terms, Properties, and Characters, are accounted for in the Old as well as New Testament. Here is the Word, God, or the Lord *Jehovah*; and here is also at the same time the Angel of God's Name, the Angel of his Presence, the Angel of the Covenant, the Patron or Guardian Angel of the Jews, their Christ or Messiah, which was at length incarnate; their Son of God, their Son of David, and their King of Israel, to whom they were originally and peculiarly committed, and of whom those Words of the Prophet are remarkable and true, *Isa. 63. 9. In all their Affliction he was afflicted; and the Angel of his presence saved them: In his Love and in his Pity he redeem'd them. And he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebell'd, and vex'd his Holy Spirit; therefore he was turn'd to be their Enemy, and he fought against them: Then he remem-*
bered

bered the days of old, Moses and his People, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the Sea, (the Angel of the Bush; and that went before them in a Pillar of Cloud, and of Fire) with the Shepherd, of his Flock? &c.

It is observable, that according to the very Contents of this Chapter, Christ speaks in it almost from the beginning to the end. I mean, he speaks plain in his Complex Person, or Nature, and according to his Passion and Sufferings as Man, as well as with respect to his Nature as God. And it appears from hence to be the same Person that dy'd for his Church, and all Nations in the New, and that foster'd the Jews in a more especial manner under the Old Testament.

In fine, it illustrates the whole Mystery of the Blessed Gospel, and makes it to be truly and surprizingly such; even the Mystery, as St. Paul calls it, which from the beginning of the World hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, i. e. in such a double Sense as hath been before explain'd, Eph. 3. 9. Nay the Grace of God, as we before heard, is said to be given us in Christ Jesus, not only *decease*, but given us in Christ Jesus before the World began. And

how

how should it be properly said farther, Tit. 1. 2. that God, who cannot lye (not only decreed, but) promis'd Eternal Life in Christ before the World began? If there was no other Region, no Soul or Spirit, no Christ, if I may thus argue, as to his Humane or Compleat Nature, before this lower World existing?

In the mean time the Scriptures here cited, agree with what the Learned and Ancient Jews were wont to say of these Matters, viz. *Ante solem preparatum est nomen Messia.* The Name or Person of the *Messiah* was prepar'd before the Sun. By which they meant what is compris'd in that other *Apborism* of theirs, *Lex fuit ante Mundum.* That the Law or Covenant of God was before the World, i. e. They were both of them, as I would expound it for them, in the *Theanthropos*, the Framer, Mediator, and Governour of the World.

Let me once more repeat, He came unto his own, and his own received him not, Joh. 1. 10. And this is he of whom Baruch speaks thus; This is our God, and there shall none other be accounted of in comparison of him. He hath found out all the ways of Knowledge, (for he is the very Word or Wisdom of the Father) and hath given it
word unto

unto Jacob his *Servant*, and to Israel his *Beloved*. Afterwards did he shew himself upon *Earth*, and conversed with Men, i. e. The *Theanthropos*, the *Word* and *Humane Soul* of *Christ*, was made *Flesh*, Chap. 3. 35, 36.

Before I conclude I must speak to *Three* Objections, against the Doctrine now deliver'd.

First, Some think they give an easie Solution to the Divine Titles, and Worship given to the Angel so frequently mentioned, by asserting that he acted, as God's Ambassador Royal unto the People of *Israel*, and so representing his most Sacred Majesty, assum'd his Names, Worship and Authority. But *this* has been so often fully answer'd in the Controversie with the *Romanists*, that I need be but brief upon it.

In short, we may justly demand, when it was ever known, that any Ambassadors from *Earthly* Princes have taken so upon them. And need I say that it is infinitely more unfit for any Ambassadour from God Almighty, between whom and such a one there is an ineffable and unconceivable distance, to be so assuming? What Ambassador ever said, I am the Great and Mighty

ty King of *France, Spain or England, &c.* Or hath permitted himself to be so call'd? Or would receive such Honours as his Master could have no higher, were he *personally* present; and *THIS* upon all Occasions? And what Prince could ever endure any thing *like* this, to be done *by* or *to* his Representative? And much less can it be imagin'd, that a Created Angel coming on an Embassy from the Great God, should offer to say, *I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: I am the God of your Fathers*; and give himself the Names of *Jehovah* and *I am*, &c. Even the most Sacred Names and Titles possible.

And hath not God himself once and again thus declar'd by his Prophet *Isaiab*, Chap. 42. 8, and 48. 11. *I will not give my Glory to another?*

The Ambassadors of Earthly Princes always speak *expresly* in their Masters Names; declare their Commissions from *them*, and their Sole Authority; and all know what their Stations and Characters are; and who can believe, that the *only* Ambassador, that calls *himself* by his Masters Name, and receives all the Homage that is due to him, should be the Ambassador of the Mighty Lord and Creator of *the* whole Universe?

Universe? I mean, except it were expressly commanded by him, that such Honour should be paid his Ambassador: But we have seen that he declares the directly contrary. But had he *not* done so, we are absolutely certain from *Natural Religion*, that he neither *will* nor *can* require giving Divine Honour to a mere *Creature*, under any Circumstance or Consideration whatsoever; nor so much as make it *lawful*. The Idea of a *Being infinitely perfect assures us*, that nothing can be more unworthy of God than this, upon too many Accounts to be *here* mention'd. See the Bishop's *Discourse*, p. 55, 56.

Secondly, It may farther perhaps be objected by some, that it is said in Scripture, *Behold I will bring forth my Servant the Branch*. And again, *Behold the Days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch*, Jer. 23. 5. And long before that, Deut. 18. 18. we read thus; *And the Lord said—I will raise them up a Prophet from among their Brethren, like unto thee, &c.* That is, you may say, if this Hypothesis be true, *I will bring forth my self, servant to my self: I will raise up my self the righteous Branch: And a Prophet among them, like unto thee.* With many

many more sayings of this or a like kind. To which I add *Exod. 23. 20. Behold I send an Angel before thee; Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not, for he will not pardon your Transgressions; for my Name is in him.* Which after the Ancient Fathers, and some other Learned Men, I confess I take to be meant of *Christ*, though not as *they*, of the *bare Logos*, but of *Christ's Soul* also, or *Created Nature*, at that time in *Union* with him: And upon which account he is call'd *Angel*, and said to be sent, or deputed. And I understand this of *Christ*, in regard of the *Divine Characters* that are here mention'd, *viz.* such as *obeying his Voice*, *pardoning Transgressions*, and having *the Name of God in him*. And when this *Angel* was here spoken of, we find not that it was spoken in any *Anger* at all; or that *God* had refus'd to go with them; or that they had committed at that time any *grievous* and *extraordinary Sin*; or that *Moses* either complain'd, or the *People* mourn'd upon the mention of it: All which *Marks* we find concurring in *Chapters 32 and 33.* and which do plainly therefore very greatly difference the former of these *Places* and *Angels* from the latter. So that the difficulty is, how *Christ*,

or

or the *Logos Theanthropos*, should speak thus of himself: *Behold I send an Angel before thee, &c.*

But both this, I think, and the other places, will be easily reconciled by the entire Union there is in the God-head; and the transcendent difference that is between the Created and Uncreated Natures of Christ. Speaking therefore as God, and sure it is fit, exceeding fit for him, to speak as he pleaseth, he is the proper Mouth of the entire Deity, the Father and Holy Spirit, as well as of himself; since the Father spake not by himself, but all along by the Person of the Son. And in this Sense, he may well in his Own and Father's Name, and so also *that* of the Blessed Spirit, as the great Fountain and Author of all, speak of the *Messiah* in his Created Nature, and as he was by their Divine Counsel and Appointment, to appear at length amongst the *Jews* as Man, and to be their expected Prince and Prophet; I say in this regard, the Divine, Simple, and Eternal *Logos*, notwithstanding the Union of Christ's Soul with him, may well speak of him as one very distinct from, and inferiour to himself; as his *Servant* and *Messenger*, as the *Man-Christ-Jesus*, and the Mediator

appointed between God and the World : And so may be said to *promise*, to *send*, to *raise him up*, &c. Even as in the New Testament, God is said to *send*, to *anoint*, to *raise up his Son Jesus*, to *speak by him*, and the like : Though as God he wanted no sending, anointing, raising, supporting, or such like ; nor was he capable of these things as such ; being Infinite in his Essence, and Uncreated Glory, and Co-eternal with the Father. And after this manner he speaks sometimes in his State of Humiliation, as *Destroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raise it up*, John 2. 19. And the Union of the *Logos* with the *Messiah's* Soul, was, as to shew his amazing Love and Condescension, so to capacitate him the better to undergo the vast Province of the Government, and Redemption of Mankind.

To conclude this : It is observable, that as there are such Passages in the Old Testament, as prove beyond Contradiction that extraordinary *Angel* mention'd to be God, and no merely Commissioned or Created Being, so on the other Hand, there are in both Testaments the plainest Expressions for the evincing again of the *Humanity* as well as *Divinity* of Christ. And he

is found very fuitably sometimes to speak as *God*, sometimes as *Man*, and sometimes as both. And notwithstanding the Union, the Humanity of the Mediator cannot possibly lessen, or in the least take off from, the Glory, Majesty, and Authority of the Divinity.

Thirdly, There is a great Objection (as it is made by some) rais'd against this Doctrine, and what hath been said, from some Passages of Scripture relating to the *Law*: As first, *Acts* 7. 53. The *Jews* are said to have receiv'd the *Law* by the disposition of *Angels*. *Gal.* 3. 19. It is said again, *To have been ordained by Angels in the Hand of a Mediator*. And lastly, *Heb.* 1. 1, 2. We read thus; *God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last Days spoken unto us by his Son*. Which implyeth seemingly that he spake not therefore by him heretofore in the *Old Testament*. And the Matter is farther pursu'd, *Chap.* 2. v. 2, 3. *And if the Word spoken by Angels was stedfast, and every Transgression and Disobedience receiv'd a just recompence of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation? Which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, &c.*

The Law in most of these Places is said to have been spoken or deliver'd by Angels; and consequently they think not by Christ, in his complex Nature at that time. But provided that the great *Angel of the Covenant*, and that Divine Being, which is so often call'd the *Angel of the Lord*, and whose Ministers the other Angels are, be suppos'd to be amongst them, the Law may still be said to be deliver'd by Angels, and yet by the Lord Christ, or *Theanthropos*, at the same time at the Head of them. But waving this, and some other things, which might also be said to some of the Texts beforemention'd; I think there is a fuller and also plainer way of answering all this.

For who denies but the Angels were concern'd in the delivery of the *Law*; and were made Instruments or Ministers of God in it? This is no more than what we have before prov'd, *viz.* That Christ the God-Angel, or the *Logos Theanthropos*, was there present, waited on, and accompanied by these, as his Host and Ministers. And what greater wonder is it, that they should be his Subjects in the Old than in the New Testament? And that Expression in *Acts* 1. 7, 8. is very remarkable; *This is he that was in the Church in the Wilderness,* namely

namely *Moses*, with the *Angel*, (*that great peculiar and extraordinary Angel*, viz. *Christ the Angel of the Covenant*; and he that is so often and solemnly stiled the *Angel of the Lord*) which spake to him in Mount Sinai, and with our *Fathers*. Who but this mighty Angel, the Lord *Jehovah* himself, spake in this manner to them in the Mount? Or who again else spake to *Moses* in the Bush? And yet *there* likewise he is term'd the *Angel* which appear'd to him in the Bush, v. 35. So that all this is still a much greater proof of the present Hypothesis, than any such places as have been alledg'd can be against it.

For, to come now to that chief place, *Heb. 1. 1, 2*. What doth it import more, but that as *God* spake heretofore to the *Fathers* by the *Prophets*, so he now had spoken unto the *People* in a super-eminent manner by his *Son*, made *Man* at length and incarnate amongst them? Where the force of the Discourse, or of the whole Comparison, lies between the speaking by the *Prophets* heretofore, but now openly and visibly, and in a State of *Manhood*, by the Lord *Christ*, or by his *Son*. They, 'tis true, were Good and Holy Men, receiv'd Instructions from God, and were Supernatural

turally Inspir'd; but not to be compar'd with Christ the God-Man, the Son of the most High, and the very Lord and Instructor of the Prophets themselves; *whom he had appointed Heir of all things, by whom also he made the Worlds.* God spake not only in time past by the Prophets, but also by himself, and by the Holy Angels: But these are pass'd over, and unmention'd, and the Comparison is only form'd, between the speaking here of God by *Prophets* heretofore, but now in a most transcendent manner by his Son *Christ*. Not that God in any respect never spake before by the *Logos*, or the Son in the Old Testament: For it is sufficiently acknowledg'd, that it was the *Word* who appear'd and acted in the whole of it; and to deny this, fights directly against all that either Ancients or Moderns, have said and prov'd on this Argument. And if it be once own'd, that Christ spake as the *Logos*, both to the Fathers and to the Prophets, and even deliver'd the *Mosaick Law* it self from Mount *Sinai*, then it will be no such great Matter to grant farther, supposing sufficient Evidence, that he might do it as the *Theanthropos*, notwithstanding any thing contain'd in this or the next Chapter.

And

And this is suitable to Chap. 12. 25. See that ye refuse not him that speaketh, viz. Christ. For if they escaped not that refused him that spake on Earth, viz. Moses, who spake and declared the Law to the People, which he had received in the Mount, and which whole Law was low and earthly in comparison of the Gospel: Much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from Heaven: From Christ, who came personally down from Heaven, which Moses never did; declar'd a far more Noble, and Heavenly Doctrine to the World than he; spake after his Death to St. Paul from thence, and propagated the Gospel by most miraculous Gifts, and Power from on High. It follows, *Whose Voice then shook the Earth; viz. Sinai.* We see this Divine Author is so far from denying that Christ spake in another kind of Capacity heretofore, that he expressly asserts, in consort with our Hypothesis, and the other Scriptures, That it was *his* Voice that shook the Earth at Sinai of Old.

And hirer may be referr'd also that Expression of the Evangelist, John 1. 17. *For the Law was given by Moses, but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ.* And again,

Did not Moses give you the Law? As the Law is sometimes said to be given by God himself; sometimes by one great and extraordinary Angel, and sometimes by the Angel, at large; so here it is said to be given by *Moses*, as the great Minister and Mediator of it. But all these will very easily therefore interpret one another; and shew the Nature and Ministry of such as were concern'd respectively in the Law, and they neither do, nor can signifie any of them, that Christ was no way of old concern'd in the speaking or giving of it; we have found you see, the expressly contrary. What therefore they contain chiefly, is only as I said, the Excellency of the Gospel above the Law; and of the Person of Christ above that of *Moses*, and of the Prophets; the importance of his appearing in the World as Man; and the unspeakable Benefits that we receive by him; with the Danger of our neglecting or abusing the same.

And thus I hope, I have sufficiently answer'd the Difficulties that may arise from the foregoing Scriptures. And now lastly, If any shall after all urge the Authority, as they may suppose, or at least Silence of the ancient Church in these Matters; or,
as

as some love to speak, the *Catholick Church*, and the *Catholick Fathers* : I answer in short, That the Ancient Church and Catholick Fathers are not so wholly silent in this Point, as may by some be imagin'd. And they forget the Doctrine of Universal *Præ-existence*, which very much obtained in those first Ages, amongst the *Jews* and *Christians*, as well as others ; and from whence our Saviour's *Præ-existence* in a more eminent manner, must of course follow. But as the *Millenarian* Doctrine, though for so many Ages held, through Mis-apprehensions, and I know not what Fate, fell by degrees, and vanish'd in the Church ; So from some *Mistakes* and Prejudices, and an unfitness of the Times for the retaining of it, might this Doctrine concerning *Christ's Soul*, sink with that more general One of *Præ-existence* at large.

'Tis evident, that the Ancients were not over-steady, or assur'd in some things ; which were both embrac'd, and laid aside in their turns by them : Such as their first *Praying for*, and afterwards in the Fourth Century, their beginning to *pray to* the Saints and Martyrs : The Communicating of Infants for so long time in some of the first Ages, and then afterwards by degrees leaving

leaving it off: With many other things that might be mention'd. It is but too well known what unhappy Turns, and Contentions they had in the Business of *Arianism*: And that after some time they fell into a very sad State, partly by outward Violence and Invasions, and partly by their Divisions and Corruptions, of Vice, Darkness, Calamity, and Apostacy at once. *Aristotle's* Philosophy had the luck to prevail, whilest other nobler Systems lay buried and neglected; and, thriving well under Popery, it had the Honour amongst the *School-Men* of being adopted, as it were, into the Christian Theology. In this Scene of Change, Uncertainty and Confusion, no wonder if generous and great Truths were dropt and let slip; and what was best adapted to the Humour and Genius of the Times, was foster'd and esteem'd.

The Truth is, the Fathers of the *first* Ages were, generally speaking, great and excellent Persons, eminent Lights of God, and Ornaments and Supports of the Church in their Times: (And sure *Origen* amongst the rest, with the best of them) and they are most valuable Witnesses of the State of Christianity, and the Faith and Lives of Professors in those Primitive Ages: And

we

we have unspeakable Reason to Honour their Memories, and to bless God for them. But when *that* is said, they had at the same time such evident Defects, and humane Frailties amongst them, such peculiarities, and such varieties of Opinions, &c. that we should be cautious of laying over-much weight upon them. 'Tis plain they were not design'd by Providence, to be the great Patterns of all sorts of Wisdom and Knowledge: So that nothing can be true that was not openly and generally profess'd by them. Alas! as there were always Imperfections amongst them, and Dross as well as Gold, so there was a sad Night in time, and by degrees to arise: But then withal a more glorious Light again to Emerge; far more excellent Seasons for Peace, Wisdom, Glory, and Happiness, if we may believe both Prophets and Apostles, to prevail at length in the Christian World. And while Knowledge in these last Ages is found so much to abound, why may it not more and more do so?

By a mistake of Scripture amongst the Ancients, and of such Appearances of God, as are there recorded; and for want of some Principles which are since advanc'd, divers of them embraced the gross Opinion of *Anthropomorphism*.

thropomorphitism. And how they varied in their Expressions, and *Determinations* afterwards, in the Points of the Holy Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour, is but too well known.

To pin our Faith upon the Sleeves of the Ancients, is what we neither do, nor ought to do. Every one, as he sees cause, makes bold to censure and dissent from them.

I will conclude these Papers with a Worthy Saying of the Learned Dean Sherlock, viz. *Is any Man forbidden to grow wiser, and upon a careful and thorough Examination of things to alter his Mind, when he sees good Reason for it? I am not ashamed to own that I am still a Learner, and hope I shall be so as long as I live; and improve my Knowledge every Day by Study and Conversation.*

F I N I S.

THE SECOND DEFENCE, &c.

I Knew nothing of the *Sermon*, wherein a Confutation of the Bishop's *Doctrine* and *Discourse* is endeavoured, till I was upon going to the Press with the *preceding* Defence ; and after I had read *that* part which contains it, I was *first* of my Lord's Opinion, that no notice needed to be taken of it, as not finding any thing, that seem'd in the least to weaken the Proofs given of his *Doctrine* in that *Discourse* : But upon *second* Thoughts he chang'd his Mind, considering what Entertainment it might meet with from those who abound not in Sense ; and also, that a Sermon Preach'd before so Learned a Body, as one of our *Universities* ; and which the Preacher was earnestly entreated too, to make more publick, as in an Advertisement he intimates he was, and that it cost him much more pains than the Sermon accompanying it, ought not in good Manners to have a Slight put upon it.

Here

Hereupon I needed not much solliciting, to be at this little trouble of affording it an Answer, as I was employing the Printer in the *other Work*.

The Text is *Galatians 4. 4.* — *God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, &c.* The Sermon begins p. 27. the Figures being carried from the foregoing One.

In the 30th Page, the Manner comes to be consider'd, *How God sent forth his Son.* And these Words follow, viz. *To send signifies in common usage to order to go, or move from one Place or Term to another.* But here the Word must be otherwise interpreted. Because the Son being of the same Nature and Substance with the Father, it is certain that he goes or moves in no other Sense than the Father himself doth; that is, not by a motion like to that of Bodies or finite Spirits, leaving a Place, or Ubi, where he was before, and passing to another, where he was not. For God the Father, and consequently God the Son, does not move in this manner; because the Divinity fills the Universe, and is every where within and without the World. But what the Scripture means by God's coming into a Place, is, that he therein some way or other manifests his Presence: And thus the
Sons

Son's being sent forth doth not here signifie a change of Station, or Term of Existence, but only of Condition or Appearance; and so denotes to us, that the Son, according to the Father's good Pleasure, was made manifest to the World, by the Humane Nature which he took upon him. And in this Sense does he say of himself, that he came forth from the Father, &c. — We will consider this Paragraph part by part.

1. I agree with the Preacher, That in common usage to send, signifies, to order to go or move, from one Place to another. But where as he saith,

2. That here the Word must be otherwise interpreted, this I partly grant, and partly utterly deny.

3. His Reason for otherwise interpreting the Word in his Text is, Because the Son being of the same Nature and Substance with the Father; 'tis certain he goes or moves in no other Sense, than the Father himself does. And this I grant of God the Son, as the second Person in the Trinity, but I deny it of him, consider'd as the Man-Christ-Jesus. 'Tis not true of him as Man, that he is of the same Nature and Substance with the Father; nor therefore that he goes or moves, in no other Sense

Sense than the Father himself does, as certain as our Preacher is of it.

4. It follows, *For God the Father, and consequently God the Son, does not move by a motion like to that of Bodies, &c. because the Divinity fills the Universe, &c.* But I deny, you see, the Consequence, in reference to God the Son, as he is a *Man* no less than *God*; and I deny this Reason of his Consequence, viz. *because the Divinity fills the Universe, &c.* For what is this to the *Humanity* of God the Son?

5. Whereas he adds, *What the Scripture means by God's coming into a Place, is, that therein he some way or other manifests himself.* Here we can have no other Controversie, but about the *Bishop's Doctrine's* being concern'd in it.

6. He saith, *And thus the Son's being sent forth, doth not here signifie a change of Station, or Term of Existence, but only of Condition or Appearance: And so denotes to us, that the Son, according to his Father's good Pleasure, was made manifest to the World by the Humane Nature, &c.* Now sure I need not repeat it, that the Son's being sent forth, both *doth*, and *doth not* signifie a change of Station: That it *doth not*, as he is *God*, but it *doth* as he
is

is Man. And therefore under *this* Consideration, his being sent may signifie more, than *its being the Father's good Pleasure to make him manifest to the World, &c.*

7. He comes now to the *Proof* of this Doctrine; and he does it from those very Texts, by which the Bishop confirmeth his own *opposite* Doctrine. So that if they are found to do *his* Business, what must be judg'd of his Lordship's Understanding? I hope care will be taken, that the World shall be troubled with no more of *his* Books. But I ask his Lordship's Pardon for *this* Liberty.

The Preacher's *first* Proof is fetcht from the *Text*, on which the Bishop grounds his Discourse of the *Descent of the Man-Christ-Jesus, &c. viz. His Declaration, John 16. 28. that He came forth from the Father, and is come into the World, &c. In this Sense, saith he, does he say of himself, that he came forth from the Father. And is therefore emphatically termed by Isaiah and Malachy, Angel and Messenger; and by the Author to the Hebrews, Ἀπόστολος.*

But how *proves* he, that Christ meant *that* Declaration in *his* Sense? If he does not prove it, I doubt the Bishop will scarce take his *bare* Word for it; at least unless

he knows him much better than *I do*. Is the Proof couched under those Words; *And is therefore emphatically termed Angel, and Messenger, and Apostle?* This is a jest; he had better never have offer'd at *any* Proof; as indeed he has not. For he could not but know, that Christ may be as properly call'd *Angel*, or (the same thing) *Messenger*, or an *Apostle*, in the *Bishop's* Sense of his Descent, as in *his* own, or rather *more* properly. But I will have no Words with him about *this*.

His *Second Text* is John. 3. 13. *No Man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man who is in Heaven.* Nothing here can contradict the Sense, the Bishop understands this place in, for the confirmation of his Doctrine, except the *is* in Heaven. And whereas his Lordship conceiveth the *is* may be render'd *was*, saying, That there is no Reason why the change of the *Tense* here, should not be admitted according to the *Hebrew Idiom*, which (with the change of *Persons* also, and *numbers*, &c.) frequently occurs in both the New and the Old Testament: And that nothing is more common than the change of one *Tense* for another; and shews also, that the great
Man

Man *Erasmus* renders the *is in Heaven* *was in Heaven*, our Preacher takes not the least notice of this; tho' his only business had been to shew, if he could, that the change of the Tense is by no means to be admitted *here*. But 'tis enough that he will not have it be, let the Bishop, or *Erasmus*, or any other Critick, think what they will. But let the *is* stand, tho' I now supposed, yet I will not grant, that it may contradict the Bishop's Doctrine; or that it can do more than make this Place, to be neither for it, nor against it. For *Grotius* and some other Expositors, by *is in Heaven*, understand whose *Conversation*, or *Heart* is there.

His next Text is v. 31. of that Chapter, *He that is of the Earth is Earthly, and speaketh of the Earth; he that cometh from Heaven is above all*. But whether this makes for the Bishop, or himself, he wholly leaves his Reader to judge. The like I say concerning his Texts next to this, Chap. 6. 32, 33, 35. *My Father giveth you the true Bread from Heaven; for the Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven, &c. Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life, &c.* And the like I say also, concerning the last of our Sa-

viour's Sayings, quoted by him, v. 38. *I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me.* And the Bishop may take it very unkindly, that *this* Place should be served like all the other, because he lays a greater than ordinary weight upon it. *This* he does in his *Reflections*, repenting his only *citing* it in his *Discourse*. And *that* Book was abroad in the World, several Weeks before this Sermon was *Preach'd*; and I am satisfied he had it in his Hands, bound with the *Discourse*, above four Months before that was *Printed*; how much above I know not.

Now in the *Reflections* are these Three Querys upon those Words, with Answers to each, *viz.*

1. Had the Eternal Word a *Will* different from God the Father's? 'Tis Blasphemy to say this.

2. Had the Man-Jesus such a Will? It is plain, 'tis shewn, from his own Words, that he had: And a Will capable too of being *opposed* to his Father's Will, tho' he kept it in perfect Subjection.

3. Did that very Person come down from Heaven, who had such a Will? And let these his own express Words answer *this* Question. See *these* Querys, p. 36, and 37. I give

I give but the Substance of the Answers. And must also *these* Words be brought to shew, that Christ only as *God*, must come down from Heaven, and therefore not by changing his *Place*, but only his *Condition*? And *this*, without saying a Syllable to the now mention'd Questions and Answers, which I think in my Conscience, do make them speak the contrary, even to a *Demonstration*.

Then he proceeds to the of Proof his Doctrine from two Texts in two Epistles of St. Paul, which he has likewise from the Bishop. The former of these is 1 Cor. 15. 47. *The first Man is of the Earth Earthly, the second Man is the Lord from Heaven.* The second *Man* is so. But I am weary of repeating it, that he contents himself only to mention the Words, without solving the seeming difficulty, there is in taking them in *his* Sense. Yet I must once more repeat the same, in reference to his latter Quotation of St. Paul, Eph. 4. 9, 10. *Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended, &c. He that descended is the same also that ascended, &c.* Now, saith the Bishop, it was the *Man Jesus* that ascended, and therefore the same *Man* descended. It must be so, if the great St.

Paul may be judge. See his Discourse, p. 18. to 21. And did *nothing* of *this* neither deserve to have one Word said to it, by one who cites the Words for the establishing of a Doctrine, that has the greatest appearance of a Contradiction to what the Apostle here affirmeth? Nay, he *does* not so much as *mention*, among the other Texts, *that* which the Bishop, as strongly as can be, reasons for his Doctrine from, viz. John 17. 5. *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me, with the Glory which I had with thee, before the (or this) World was.* As nothing but a Communication of Ideoms can look like helping our Preacher *here*, so his Lordship has made it evident, that *here* can be no Place for that Figure. And he took care to say nothing to *this*, by his talking, as I said, no notice of the Text. The like to which, had he done as to all the other, he would certainly have done most advisedly.

Now since our Preacher was pleased to say nothing, to any of those many Texts in *particular*, doth he say any thing to them in the *lump*, and taken altogether? Yes he does, and it is what follows. *Now all these Texts, so far at least as they concern my present Purpose, what else do they import,*

import, but what I said before, namely, that the moving or passing of the God-head hither or thither, is only its appearing or manifesting it self in this or that Term or Place, &c. p. 31. I shall now transcribe many more of his Lines, and reflect on them distinctly as I go along. And as to these Words, *What else do all these Texts import, but what I said before?* What else do they, that is, can they import? He will have it to be as clear as the Light at Noon, that they are all certain Proofs of his own Doctrine. Is not this assurance with a *Witness*? But does he really think the Bishop so forsaken of his *Senses*, as to take those Texts for *Confirmations* of his Doctrine, all of which are the most manifest *Confutations*? And must he needs blab abroad what he thinks? If he has no Deference at all for the judgment of this Bishop, were I as he, I would have more Reverence for his *Person*; and especially when at the same time, I *highly Esteem* him, as he tells the World he does. But what thinks he of the Brains of Dr. *Henry More*, and of Dr. *Cudworth*; with whose Worth he has extraordinarily well acquainted himself; and so has got the Reputation of a *great Pains-taker*? yet I think he had

lost no Honour, had he been content with being the *Abridger* of his most Excellent Book, and not taken upon him to be an *Improver* too. But *this* great Man also, was of a quite contrary Opinion to *his*, concerning the meaning of all those and the like Texts. I *know* this to be true: And I can add to *these* many, *many* more, whose Learning, and Acuteness, will never be thought *inferior* to this Gentleman's; whatsoever Opinion *himself* may have of it. And could he Preach and Print too, at *this* assuming rate, upon this grand Point, and, presume he should never hear of it again? What if the *Bishop's* Age and Maladys must needs make him weary of engaging in *more* Contests, could he think he is forsaken of all his *Friends*; or rather that the Doctrine he is so Enamour'd with, should be left, for the future, wholly defenceless? Have past peltings at it come off so bravely, as to encourage him to take up and discharge his Pot-Gun?

But I must proceed. It follows, *And so the Son of God was sent forth, and descended from Heaven, when, by the good will and appointment of the Father, he appear'd upon Earth in Humane Flesh.* And did the *Bishop* ever deny this? He has
said

said more *than* enough to put it out of
 doubt, that he was far from imagining that
 Christ as *God*, was not descended from
 Heaven, when he appear'd on Earth in
 Humane Flesh, or that in so doing he
 chang'd his Station, or that as *God* he can
 properly be said to *move*, or could *locally*
 descend, or otherwise than in a figurative
 Sense, as he chang'd his Appearance. And
 none that have not an intolerable Notion
 of *the* Deity, can be of another Mind.
 But as to what concerns the Bishop, the
 Question is not, whether God the Son did
 descend in appearing in Humane Flesh,
 (whether this be *properly* express'd or no)
 but whether also, consider'd as *Man*, he
 did descend, that is in the *proper* Sense?
 And so far was he from denying, that
 Christ as *God* descended, that his Doctrine
 makes it absolutely necessary that he should
 do so, as the Soul of the *Man*-Jesus was
 made inseparable from the *God* by the Hy-
 postatical Union. By the way therefore,
 strictly speaking, his Descent was not his
Appearance in Flesh, but it consisted in the
 Ancient Union of the Soul of the *Messiah*
 with him, when it (in the local Sense) de-
 scended to be *made Flesh*, or take a
 Body.

Then

Then he goes on, saying, *For thus, because the Position of the Earth is below that of Heaven, the Son, when manifested on the former, is therefore affirm'd to have descended from the latter: Where for the like Reason, he is emphatically said to have resided before.* Not that, absolutely speaking, he either ascends or descends at all, but he is respectively said to do so; that is, in regard to those Terms or Places, in which he is made manifest, and which do alternately bear the Relation of high and low, upward and downward.

O what brave People are these School-Men, Logicians and Metaphysicians! As they can find Knots, even in a Bulrush, and render the plainest things obscure; so, when in a good Humour, they can, you see, condescend to the Understandings of the most Simple. This Paragraph is so easie an Account of our Saviour's Descent from Heaven, that who can blame our Preacher, should he endeavour to have it put into our Church-Catechism? Had our Blessed Saviour pleased to express this Point thus, well might his Disciples have said, *Lo, now speakest thou plainly*; and there had never been any Controversie about this Doctrine. But then if all our Christian

Doctrines

Doctrines should be expressed in the Bible with such indisputable Clearness, what would become of our great Clerks, our *Rabbys*? Their People would take themselves to be as Wise as *they* are.

And I will now tell our Preacher in great earnest, that as seldom as the Word *Priest-Craft* is heard from *my* Mouth, I am shrewdly tempted to suspect that the Protestants are not so quite got rid of a *Pope* in *their* Bellies, but that there is too much remaining of *this* Craft in those, who can't be satisfied with the Language of *Scripture*, in expressing Articles of Faith, and are very angry with those that *can*. I am well enough aware, what they say for themselves, but I leave them to Mr. *Chillingworth* for an Answer.

He proceeds in *these* Words, *All which being most plain, shall we tamely give up the Texts before-mention'd, those Characteristicks of the true Son of God, to the Arian Faction? Or shall we apply them to the Pre-existent Soul of Christ? Surely this would be to aggrandize the Man-Christ-Jesus at the expence of the God; and so to do no little Service to the Opposers of our Lord's Divinity.*

All which being most plain. He means, I think, both that the foregoing Account is so, and that 'tis most plain, that all his Texts do make it appear so. Now as to *this* Account, that it is *most plain*, you may, if you please, take *my* Word given you now for it. But if 'tis most plain too, that those Texts do make this Account so plain, in troth, no thanks at all to our *Preacher* for it: Who has done no more to prove them so, than saying, *What else do all these Texts import?* And hath saved himself farther pains, by referring his Reader to the Bishop's *Discourse* in these Words, *Upon all these Texts may be read, the Right Reverend and Pious, and by me much Esteemed, Lord Bishop of Gloucester's Discourse, concerning the Descent, &c.* Would not any one in the World now, at the first sight, conclude, that he quotes his Lordship on his *own* side? Was ever the fellow to this met with? Since I was an *Inch long*, I am certain I never met with the like. But after all, has he not put a *Trick* upon us? Is not his thus condemning the Pre-existent Doctrine very *Banter*? Does he not design in all this to take the Bishop's *part*? I am told he is a very *grave Man*, but I have known very grave *Wags* too.

too. I cannot, for my Life, fetch him off with any Credit, if I have not hit upon the true Mystery: Though he ought to have made choice of a less serious Subject, to be thus *merry* upon. But, be it as it will, I must go on still to be *serious* with him.

Shall we tamely give up the Texts before-mention'd? And *he* shews himself a mighty Champion, does he not? In defending the Texts against *Arians* and *Pre-existent Men*, when he leaves every one of them to take its chance, and shift for it self?

This would be to Aggrandize the Man-Christ-Jesus, at the expence of the God. He might as well have said at the expence of God the *Father*, as of God the *Son*. But does our Preacher in the least matter *what* he saith, so he may but expose the Bishop, at least his *Doctrine*? For doth it, *can* it, cast the least shadow of Dishonour, on God the Son, or Eclipse in the *least* his Glory, to believe that the Soul of the *Messiah* was created in *Heaven*; and that its *Union* began *there*, many Ages before its Descent into *this World*?

Is it more Dishonourable to him, or one jot the less Honourable, to receive him into Union in the Kingdom of Heaven, than

to

to do it in the Virgin's Womb? But it is indeed a very *high Aggrandizing* of the Man-Christ-Jesus, upon many Accounts, to prove him to have been in a most Glorious State, and then most willing to leave it, in order to the Redemption of Mankind, for the very other *Extreme*. Our Preacher seems not to doubt of *this*, as no one in his Wits (nor scarce *out* of them) can; but how could such a Thought enter his Head, as that God the Son is made ever the *less* for the *Man-Jesus's* being so great? One line of a Reply hereto is too much. I cannot now forbear to ask this Question, if none can be so hardy, as to venture on demonstrating, that what our Lord has declar'd of his *coming forth from the Father*, &c. could not possibly be meant by him in the only plain and literal Sense, can any Man doubt but that 'tis far more safe, to err on the *right* Hand, or on his Saviour's *side*, if he should chance to be in an Error in this Matter? Taking *this* in too, that there are very many Scriptures which most plainly declare for the Bishop's Doctrine on our Saviour's side, but no one that contradicts it; or, as the Bishop saith, doth so much as *seem* to contradict it, And

And so to do no little service to the Opposers of our Lord's Divinity.

I should ask, how 'tis possible that *these* Words also should drop from his Pen, but that the Bishop's *Aggrandizing the Man-Christ-Jesus, at the Expence of the God*, doth *imply* them; and therefore in the Answer given to *those* Words, these are answer'd too. But our Preacher might have shew'd his profess'd *Esteem* for the Bishop, by putting in one Word *here* in his behalf, *viz.* That he could not be *aware* of this dreadful Consequence, since he hath most substantially *prov'd* our Lord's Divinity, even in *that* his Discourse. But I desire no easier task, than being bound to prove that his Doctrine doth no little *disservice* to the Socinians, and *this* my Lord has *shewn* in part, p. 44. And I cannot think, but they are Sagacious enough to be well aware of it. He goes on, *This, it might suffice to have hinted in general, as the Sense of the Universal Church, were I not tempted, thro' a well-meaning Zeal, to reflect a little farther on some late Scruples rais'd against it, &c.*

— *As the Sense of the Universal Church.* He must mean against the *Pre-existent*, as well as the *Arian* Doctrine; since

since *that* comes in after the *Arian*. But let him receive the same Answer, in reference to the *Universal Church*, which is given by the Bishop, p. 12 to 15. of his *Reflections*.

— *Through a well-meaning Zeal*. I will not judge of the meaning of his Zeal, but we have seen how much this his Zeal of God is according to Knowledge.

— *To Reflect a little further*. And 'tis well he calls it *Reflecting* a little further, since hitherto he has but *barely* *Reflected*; having backed his *Reflections* with no *Confutations*, nor offers at any.

And here, saith he, if it be asked, *How could he be properly said to come down from Heaven, or to come down personally, who could not for a Moment be out of Heaven, any more than God the Father, from whom he is inseparable?*

This is the Bishop's Question, and he answers bravely, viz. thus, *Touching this indeed I will grant, that the Son, or second Person of the Blessed Trinity, could no more properly be said to descend from, so as to quit or leave the Abodes of Heaven, than the Father himself could: The former, as GOD, being immense and every where, as well as the latter.*

And

And does not the *Bishop* say this too? Only he is such an Heretick as to say, that as he is a *Man*, he cannot be *every where*; and therefore will have the *Man-Christ-Jesus* to have descended *properly*, and *personally*, as he afterwards *ascended*.

However, I say, 'tis agreeable to the *Scriptural*, and from that to the vulgar way of speaking, to mention God as such, or even the *Father* in particular, as fixed in one certain *Ubi* or *Place*, so as seemingly to imply an exclusion, or denial of his presence elsewhere. Thus doth not the *Royal Psalmist* tell us, that our God is in the *Heavens*? And other *Scriptures* of the same kind follow, as if there were need of them; whereas there was no need of any one. But is it also agreeable to the *Scriptural* way of speaking, to mention *Christ*, as a *Man*, just as God the *Father*, or *Christ* as God, are mention'd? He proceeds.

But shall we hence infer, that God the *Father* is not essentially and substantially on *Earth*, and every where else, as well as in *Heaven*? No certainly, nor by Consequence, I add, have we any better ground, to infer from the mention of *Jesus Christ's* descent from *Heaven*, that he was not still essentially there, but only upon *Earth*, because literally

said to have come down thither? He would have said thence.

No certainly; and I say also no certainly; or that we ought by no means to make such an Inference as that

Nor by Consequence, I add, &c. He runs too far now; for this Consequence must be flatly denied, viz. That therefore we have no better Ground to infer from the mention of Jesus Christ's descent from Heaven, that he was not still essentially there, &c. For God the Father, and I add God the Son too as God, may be essentially and substantially on the Earth, and every where, tho' said to be in Heaven; and yet nothing may be more evidently false than to say this of him as Man; of the Man-Christ-Jesus; as one would think he must needs see by this time. And what saith he next? 'Tis this, In reference to God the Son, as well as God the Father, shall we allow of no Rhetorical Expressions, no Tropes or Figures in the Divine Stile, but must all be interpreted in a plain downright meaning?

The Question is not, whether Rhetorical Expressions, Tropes or Figures, be to be allow'd of in reference to both, but when they are to be allow'd of. He will not offer to say they are to be always. We

bin)

H

allow

allow of them, even in the *Man-Christ*-
Jesus his own Declarations concerning him-
 self; or we must believe *Transubstantiation*,
 and that *Christ* is properly a *Vine*, and
 properly a *Door*. But must we therefore
 interpret all his Declarations of himself
 by *Figures*? And the only thing incum-
 bent upon him, is to prove that his many
 Declarations of his coming down from *Hea-*
ven, are so to be interpreted. But this, as
 hath been said often enough, he never at-
 tempted to prove; except dogmatical as-
 serting be the same with proving. But I
 will soon have done with this, after I have
 minded him of the old Theological Rule,
 relating to *Figures*. The Bishop has laid
 this Rule down in his *Reflections*, p. 33.
 but I give it him in the Dean of *St. Paul's*
Words, viz. That we ought never to have
 recourse to a strained and metaphorical Sense,
 but when we know that the Nature of the
 thing will not admit of a proper and natu-
 ral Sense. But this is infinitely far from
 being the Case here. For who has the
 Forehead to say, that the *Man-Jesus*, or
 the Soul of the *Messias*, could never have
 been in Heaven, before he came hither;
 or that this does imply a Contradiction or
 Absurdity? He may say, that the Bishop

has added *these* Words to the Rule, which the Dean omits, *viz.* That the Scriptures are never to be understood *figuratively, where they will bear, the Contexts and other most perspicuous Places consider'd, a proper Sense.* And I say, let this Preacher shew, that the literal Sense of those Declarations of our Lord, is contrary to the Contexts, or any perspicuous Places, (I may venture to add, or *any* Places, perspicuous or not) and I will not be so very positive, that they are not to be expounded by some Figure or other. He goes on,

Shall we deny that the Scripture, it may be, in this respect as well as many others, is prudentially adapted to the Genius and Reach of ordinary Capacities; to the End that such as cannot, or at least have not, rais'd their Minds to an Apprehension of Infinity and Immensity, might be brought more particularly to acknowledge and adore the Almighty; where he displays the most evident Tokens and Effects of his Being and Perfections, &c.?

But I say again, what is this to our Lord's Humanity? Cannot ordinary Capacities raise themselves to an Apprehension of *this*, because they cannot to the Apprehension of *Infinity*, &c.? Then he tells us, That

we

we read that God has sometimes display'd the Tokens of his Being and Perfections by outward Symbols and visible Signs, proposed to the Eyes of Men: As when he appear'd to Abraham and Jacob, in the shape of a Man, to Moses in that of a burning Bush.

But what is this to his Purpose? Which, by the way, saith he, and other the like Apparitions mention'd in Scripture, in vain have some endeavour'd to interpret of one or more Representative Angels. And in this I am as much as can be of his Mind. But whereas he adds, That as vainly would any one go to interpret them of the Soul of Christ Jesus, as then pre-existing, albeit in a State of Union with the Logos, &c. Here I must leave him. And I will save my self the trouble of transcribing more of these Lines, by referring him to the foregoing Defence: Where he will see a great deal to open his Eyes, if he has but any freedom of Mind; as I perceive he has but very little. And in reference to those last Words of his, I desire he would take special notice of these of that Worthy and Learned Defender, viz. It seems most harsh to make God the Son by himself to appear in an Humane Shape, visit, eat and drink, and converse with Men after such a manner. How can this

suit with the Eternal Word, or Naked Divinity? Doth it not seem infinitely too low a thing, for the Infinite, All-Comprehending Majesty of God to submit unto? But if we understand it of the Soul of Christ in Hypostatical Union with the Eternal Son of God, who was afterward to be the Word made Flesh, or God manifested in the Flesh; and these Manifestations, or Appearances in an Human Figure to be Præludiums thereof, we shall not look upon all this as hard to be conceived, &c.

And whereas he will have the *Fathers* to be unacquainted with *this* Notion, tho' they generally held that the *Logos* was the Person that appear'd so frequently; I say what of *that*? Thanks be to God this is a freer Age, than for *Fathers* to be presumed now to know all things, or to be infallible in what they pretend to know. No, no, we know too much of the Notions, and Opinions that they entertain'd, too many of them, to conclude any Doctrine true because *they* held it, or false because *they* contradicted it; and much less because they were unacquainted with it. And yet they are of very great use too, tho' I will not so digress as to say here how they are so,

But

But, saith our Preacher, *Why might not the Divinity, as well as the Soul of Christ Jesus, then assume to it self an Human Appearance, &c?* And 'tis sufficient for me to reply, *Why might not the Soul of Christ, then assume to it self such an Appearance, as well as the Divinity?* But the *Defence* sheweth, that it seems exceedingly more fit that his *Soul* should, than that the *bare Divinity* should. And I need not say, that the *Divinity did*, as in *Union* with the *Soul*.

The next thing he saith is, *That if the Descent of Christ Jesus be not to be interpreted of him as God, how then shall we come off with some other places of Holy Writ, &c.*

But he could not have read the Bishop's Discourse at all, or had his Mind upon nothing in reading it, but taking all occasions for Cavilling, if he needs to be told that there is no such thing in that Discourse, as Christ's not descending as *God*; but there's enough of the contrary; and all he can accuse the Bishop of, is, what himself acknowledgeth, *viz.* That he could not descend in a *proper* Sense as *God*. Then he taxeth him, with what he *thinks* (so modest is he) is an *Erroneous* Assertion, *viz.* *That neither can the second Person as God,*
H 5 be

be said to come forth from the Father, except by necessary Emanation, as Light from the Sun. Referring to p. 23, 24. of the Discourse.

1. Why could he not give the Words *there* as he found them? Which are *these*, Nor could he for that Reason be said to come forth from the Father, except by necessary Emanation, &c.

2. Why could he not as well have put in, *be said properly or personally* to come forth from the Father? Since he saw these two Adverbs in the Words immediately foregoing. But he saw too, if he should do *thus*, he had better have let this Assertion alone, or not have intimated it to be *Erroneous*.

3. Why did he leave for that Reason out? Nor could he for that Reason be said to come down from the Father, viz. because he is (*viz. as God*) inseparable from the Father. And I humbly conceive this is a good Reason. Then he adds a few Lines after, *Not that the Son, as is suggested, was upon this supposition separated from God the Father, because the Gospel tells us more than once, that the Person sent was still with God, and in Heaven; and its being said that he was sent, only intimates this,*
that

that his presence on Earth was in a special manner declar'd and manifested, he having now obtain'd a new Mode of Existing and Acting. And for this he cites four Fathers, all of them later than the three first Centuries. And to these, he saith, I might add the consenting Suffrage of all the other Ancient Catholick Writers.

Now I will here again put in a few Remarks.

1. Not that the Son, as is suggested, was separated, &c. The Reader will see that this is his own, not the Bishop's Suggestion.

2. Because the Gospel tells us, that the Person sent, was still with God, &c. But does it tell us, that as Man he was still with God and in Heaven? He knows that the Bishop saith that as God, he could not be otherwise.

3. His being sent only intimates, that his presence on Earth, was in an especial manner declar'd, &c. And the Bishop (as he knows too) will not dispute with him about this, considering Christ as God. And as he has worded it, he begs the Question still; for, as hath been often enough observed, he proves nothing of this.

4. As

4. As to his *Fathers*, the Words he cites of theirs at the bottom of the Page, if I would be at the pains of transcribing them, I can shew, that they may be fairly interpreted of Christ, only as *God*, and therefore there's no Contradiction in them, to the Bishop's Doctrine.

5. I might add the consenting Suffrage (*consenting* needed not) of all the other Catholick Writers. And has he read them all? I scarcely think it. But he has seen, that much elder Fathers than any he here cites, are brought in by the Bishop as Assertors of his Doctrine.

After this he finds fault with *Tertullian's* and *Grotius* his Interpretation of the Word *Christ*, mention'd by the Bishop, viz. That 'tis *Nomen hominis*, & *Vocabulum humane nature*. And to this he saith, That the Word doth not directly imply Nature, or not the Human, any more than the Divine Nature. And I am sure the Bishop will not contend with him about this, for 'tis as much to his Purpose, to have it acknowledg'd to imply the Human, as well as the Divine Nature.

And now comes his parting Stroke with the Bishop, p. 42. I might farther produce a mul-

a multitude of Texts, &c. but shall only single out a Specimen of them, &c. leaving it to the Judgment of this Learned Audience, whether or no they directly point at the Divine and Human Natures, or at the Pre-existent Soul, and the Body of Christ Jesus. I will leave it to the Judgment of this Learned Audience, &c. Now I see why he proves nothing, namely, because 'twould be an Affront to the Judgment of so Learned an Audience, to lay Proofs before them.

The Specimen of his multitude of Texts consists of Five, viz.

2 Cor. 8. 9. — Tho' he was rich, &c. The Bishop for some time dwells upon this Text, as a great Proof his Doctrine; and indeed I am much satisfied with it as such; but it was not for him to vouchsafe a Word of answer, because, I suppose, the Judgment of his Learned Audience must needs save him this Labour.

Phil. 2. 6, 7. — Who being in the form of God, &c. And what the Bishop saith on this Proof has the same respect shewn it, not for his sake; I need not repeat for whose. Nor need I give the same Remark on Col. 1. 14, 15. nor on Heb. 10. 5. nor on John 3. 13. which make up his five Texts.

But

But his Lordship, now I think better of it, has no Cause to complain of *Disrespect* for what was said of his *other* Texts, we have repeated of *these* in these Words, *Upon all which Texts may be consulted the Bishop of G. in the Discourse aforesaid.* So that when all comes to all, the Bishop of Gloucester and our Preacher must be perfectly of a Mind; and he pins his Faith upon his Lordship's Sleeves. And now I think it high time to bid him *Farewell*, which I do heartily.

4 AP 65

E. I. N. I. S.

